Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BS2795 .J73
Johnstone, Robert. MAIN
The First Epistle of Peter : revised tex
3 9967 00116 8132

ACCESSION NUMBER 24344
SHELF NUMBER BS 2795 J 73
The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.
From the Stanley McCormick Fund.
RECEIVED

PROFESSOR EADIE'S COMMENTARIES.

MESSRS. CLARK, with the concurrence of the Trustees of the late PROFESSOR EADIE, beg to announce the issue, in Three Volumes 8vo, of the following Commentaries:—

EPHESIANS. PHILIPPIANS. COLOSSIANS.

The Three Volumes will be supplied by Subscription at the price of

EIGHTEEN SHILLINGS,

or, in separate Volumes, at Ten Shillings and Sixpence each.

They have been carefully Edited by

The Rev. WILLIAM YOUNG, M.A., Glasgow.

The value of these Commentaries is well known. They occupy a first and distinctive place in New Testament exegetical literature.

These Volumes have been out of print for a considerable time, and all of them are much in demand.

In crown 8vo, price 6s.,

STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

By ALEXANDER MAIR, D.D.

'Dr. Mair has made an honest study of Strauss, Renan, Keim, and "Supernatural Religion," and his book is an excellent one to put into the hands of doubters and inquirers.'—*English Churchman.*

'Will in every way meet the wants of the class for whom it is intended, many of whom are "wayworn and sad," amid the muddled speculations of the current day.'—*Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

In demy 8vo, price 9s.,

LECTURES ON PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

By Rev. Dr. HUTCHISON.

'We have not—at least amongst modern works—many commentaries on these epistles in which the text is at once treated with scholarly ability, and turned to popular and practical account. Such is the character of Dr. Hutchison's work—his exegesis of crucial passages strikes us at once as eminently clear.'—*Baptist.*

'Certainly one of the ablest and best commentaries that we have ever read. The style is crisp and clear. and the scholarship is in no sense of a superficial or pretentious order.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

By the same Author.

Just published in demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

LECTURES ON PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

'This book has one great merit which separates it from the mass of commentaries and expository lectures—it is not only instructive, but it is also delightfully interesting. . . . The author's moral and spiritual tone is lofty, and these sermons are characterized by a sweet and sunny grace, which cannot but charm and make better those who read them.'—*Literary World.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 3s. 6d.,

SECOND EDITION, REVISED,

THE THEOLOGY

AND

THEOLOGIANS OF SCOTLAND,

CHIEFLY OF THE

Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.

Being one of the 'Cunningham Lectures.'

By JAMES WALKER, D.D., CARNWATH.

CONTENTS.—CHAP. I. Survey of the Field. II. Predestination and Providence. III. The Atonement. IV. The Doctrine of the Visible Church. V. The Headship of Christ and Erastianism. VI. Present Misrepresentation of Scottish Religion. VII. Do Presbyterians hold Apostolical Succession?

'These pages glow with fervent and eloquent rejoinder to the cheap scorn and scurrilous satire poured out upon evangelical theology as it has been developed north of the Tweed.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'We do not wonder that in their delivery Dr. Walker's lectures excited great interest; we should have wondered far more if they had not done so.'—Mr. SPURGEON in *Sword and Trowel.*

'As an able and eloquent vindication of Scottish theology, the work is one of very great interest—an interest by no means necessarily confined to theologians. The history of Scotland, and the character of her people, cannot be understood without an intelligent and sympathetic study of her theology, and in this Dr. Walker's little book will be found to render unique assistance.'—*Scotsman.*

PÜNJER'S

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 16s.,

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION,

FROM THE REFORMATION TO KANT.

By BERNHARD PÜNJER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY W. HASTIE, B.D.

WITH A PREFACE BY PROFESSOR FLINT, D.D., LL.D.

'The merits of Pünjer's history are not difficult to discover; on the contrary, they are of the kind which, as the French say, *sautent aux yeux.* The language is almost everywhere as plain and easy to apprehend as, considering the nature of the matter conveyed, it could be made. The style is simple, natural, and direct; the only sort of style appropriate to the subject. The amount of information imparted is most extensive, and strictly relevant. Nowhere else will a student get nearly so much knowledge as to what has been thought and written, within the area of Christendom, on the philosophy of religion. He must be an excessively learned man in that department who has nothing to learn from this book.'—*Extract from the Preface.*

'Pünjer's "History of the Philosophy of Religion" is fuller of information on its subject than any other book of the kind that I have either seen or heard of. The writing in it is, on the whole, clear, simple, and uninvolved. The Translation appears to me true to the German, and, at the same time, a piece of very satisfactory English. I should think the work would prove useful, or even indispensable, as well for clergymen as for professors and students.'—DR. HUTCHISON STIRLING.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... GEO. HERBERT.

NEW YORK, ... SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

THE

FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER:

REVISED TEXT,

WITH

Introduction and Commentary.

BY

ROBERT JOHNSTONE, LL.B., D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS IN THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1888.

Σίμων, Σίμων, . . . σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας
στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.

LUKE xxii. 31, 32.

22194

VIRGINIA LIBRARY
MCCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

2705
J 73

TO

THE REV. JOHN CAIRNS, D.D., LL.D.,

THE REV. DAVID DUFF, D.D., LL.D.,

THE REV. JAMES A. PATERSON, M.A.,

This Book is Inscribed

BY

THEIR FRIEND AND COLLEAGUE,

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

—o—

In the Commentary which forms the larger part of this book the author's aim has been, by a careful examination of the grammatical structure of the Epistle, to ascertain, as exactly as the data permit, what is taught in it, and how the different parts of the teaching are related to each other. His chief desire has been to trace the course of thought, and he trusts that, whilst words and constructions have been discussed with what seemed adequate fulness, yet it will be found that at no point has the principal purpose of the work been lost sight of in mere philological or grammatical disquisition. In studying this Epistle one has in but small measure that illustration of specialties of thought or expression which is supplied by other writings or recorded utterances of the same author, —such as is enjoyed so abundantly by a student occupied with a work of Paul or John. Some helpful hints of this kind, however, have been obtained, especially from the discourses of Peter preserved in Acts. But the chief aid to be found in Scripture for the elucidation of the apostle's language is derived from the Septuagint. His style is to so great an extent moulded by its influence, and his thoughts, even when he is not formally quoting, or in any definite way following Old Testament lines, so tend to clothe themselves in the phraseology of the Alexandrian version, that the help afforded by reference to it—important in the study of any Hellenistic writing—is pre-eminently valuable here. Outside of Scripture, illustration of the apostle's words and constructions has been sought for mainly in Philo and in the earliest post-apostolic Christian literature.

All those commentators on the Epistle from whom the author had any reason to believe that help might be obtained have been carefully consulted. His obligations are specially great to Bengel, Wiesinger, and Professor Salmond of Aberdeen. From several of the less strictly critical expositions of the Epistle, also, he has in various ways and degrees received help, particularly from the classic work of Leighton, and from the Expository Lectures of Professor John Brown of Edinburgh, and Dr. John Lillie of Kingston, New York. In the discussion of passages susceptible of different interpretations, only views of the meaning which seemed to have at least a moderate degree of likelihood have been dealt with in the Commentary, or indeed, as a rule, even mentioned,—the book being intended, not as a storehouse of curiosities or whimsical conceits, but as an aid to the practical study of Scripture. An endeavour has been made also to avoid loading the pages with needless lists of the names of scholars holding the various positions. Names have been mentioned only when they seemed to be in themselves to a certain extent arguments, or to afford something of interesting or helpful illustration. On questions connected with the specialties of Hellenistic Greek, the New Testament Grammars of Winer and Alexander Buttmann are frequently referred to (the references being made to the English translations by Moulton and Thayer), occasionally also the excellent little work of Sheldon Green. For the grammar of classical Greek, Jelf and Donaldson have been used.

There are no formal Dissertations or *Excursus*. Several of the discussions, in particular those on the exegesis of chap. iii. 19, 20, and chap. iv. 6, are considerably detailed; but the arrangement of the book—in which the text is printed, not over the expository notes, but at the beginning—permitted these to be kept in their place in the Commentary. In the Table of Contents a reference is made to matters treated with special fulness.

The text which is given in the volume may be described

as, in substance, that of Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, for there are but few passages in the Epistle with respect to which there is not a *consensus* of critical authority. On the more important of the passages regarding which there is not agreement, short notes indicate the grounds on which the reading of the text has been adopted.

The author is greatly indebted to his friend the Rev. Alexander Mair, D.D., Morningside, Edinburgh, for aid most kindly and efficiently rendered in the revision of the proofs.

May the Father of lights, from whom has come the "good and perfect gift" of Holy Scripture, bless this humble attempt to expound a portion of His Word! May He forgive its errors and defects, and graciously use it in some measure as an instrument for advancing the interests of truth and righteousness!

United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh,
February 1, 1888.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

TEXT AND CRITICAL NOTES, ... xiii

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Genuineness, ... 1
§ 2. To whom written, ... 10
§ 3. Occasion and date, ... 18
§ 4. Place where written, ... 22
§ 5. Structure and literary characteristics, ... 28

COMMENTARY.

CHAPTER I., ... 40

Meaning of *πρόγνωσις*, ver. 2, ... 43
Meaning of *ἁγιασμός*, ver. 2, ... 46
Present or future reference of vv. 6–9, ... 60
Interesting use of *οὐ* and *μή*, ver. 8, ... 72
"Spirit of Christ," ver. 11, ... 78
Force of *ἄμωμος*, ver. 19, ... 99

CHAPTER II., . . . 113

Meaning of *ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις*, ver. 13, ... 152
Connection of precepts in ver. 17, ... 161
Meaning of *ἀνήνεγκεν*, ver. 24, ... 182

CHAPTER III., . . . 192

Summary of section iii. 18–iv. 6, ... 243
"Quickened in spirit," ver. 18, ... 246
"Spirits in prison," vv. 19, 20, ... 249
Meaning of *ἐπερώτημα κτλ.*, ver. 21, ... 292

PAGE

CHAPTER IV., . . . 301

Force of πέπαυται ἁμαρτίαις, ver. 1, ... 303
Force of ἀνάχυσις, ver. 4, ... 316
Meaning of νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη κτλ., ver. 6, ... 319
"Spirit of glory and of God," ver. 14, ... 359
"Judgement beginning from God's house," ver. 17, . . . 366

CHAPTER V., . . . 378

Meaning of μάρτυς κτλ., ver. 1, ... 379
Meaning of στέφανος ἀμαράντινος, ver. 4, ... 388
Force of ἐγκομβοῦσθαι, ver. 5, ... 393

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Α.

—o—

1 ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρε-
πιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας,
2 Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας, κατὰ πρόγνωσιν Θεοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐν
ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος, εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.
3 Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς
εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ
4 νεκρῶν, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμά-
5 ραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει
Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην
6 ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ. ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὀλί-
7 γον ἄρτι, εἰ δέον, λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, ἵνα
τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως, πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου,
τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου, εὑρεθῇ εἰς
ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ

Critical Notes.

With regard to all but a few passages in this Epistle, the evidence of our authorities for the text is so clear and satisfying that there is agreement among the principal critical editors. Of those places where the reading is uncertain, there are two or three of which, through the bearing of the variation on exegesis, it has been found convenient to discuss the reading not here but in connection with the exposition. On these a simple reference to the Commentary will be found below. On the others, a brief statement is given here of the grounds for preferring the reading of the text. No attempt is made to set forth the full evidence for the variants; which is abundantly accessible in the Digests of Tischendorf and Tregelles. What is aimed at is simply to indicate those elements in each case which appear most important.

8 Χριστοῦ· ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες
πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶτε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξα-
9 σμένῃ, κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, σωτηρίαν
10 ψυχῶν. Περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηραύνησαν
προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες,
11 ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς
Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθή-
12 ματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας· οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ
ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτὰ, ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ
τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἀποσταλέντι
ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι.
13 Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν,
νήφοντες, τελείως ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν
14 χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς,
μὴ συνσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν
15 ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς Ἅγιον καὶ
16 αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε· διότι γέγραπται,
17 Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος. Καὶ εἰ Πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε
τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον,
ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε,
18 εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ
19 τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, ἀλλὰ
τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ,
20 προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος
21 δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ
πιστοὺς εἰς Θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ
δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα
εἶναι εἰς Θεόν.

I. 8. The active ἀγαλλιᾶτε appears to be the true reading here. The occurrence of this rare form in at least two authorities of the first class, B, and a citation in Origen, and probably also in C,—whilst the ordinary middle form is found without variation a few lines before (ver. 6),—cannot well be accounted for except on the supposition that it was in the original. The only thing at all likely to have led copyists to write the active by mistake is the assonance with ἀγαπᾶτε in the clause preceding; and if this really had any influence in determining the form, it may with at least as great probability be supposed to have led the apostle himself to choose the active, as to have turned transcribers astray.

22 Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας
εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον, ἐκ καρδίας ἀλλήλους
23 ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς, ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς
φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου, διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ
24 μένοντος· διότι Πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα δόξα
αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου· ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ
25 ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν· τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.
2 Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ
2 ὑποκρίσεις καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλιὰς, ὡς ἀρτι-
γέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα
3 ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς
4 ὁ Κύριος. Πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι, λίθον ζῶντα, ὑπὸ
ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν
5 ἔντιμον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος
πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς
6 θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· διότι
περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ, Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον ἀκρογωνι-
αῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ
7 καταισχυνθῇ. Ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν· ἀπι-
στοῦσιν δὲ Λίθος ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος
8 ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος
καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου· οἳ προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπει-
9 θοῦντες· εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν. ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτὸν,
βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν,
ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέ-
10 σαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, οἵ ποτὲ οὐ λαὸς, νῦν
δὲ λαὸς Θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.
11 Ἀγαπητοὶ, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους
ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵτινες στρατεύονται
12 κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς· τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν
ἔχοντες καλὴν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλοῦσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν,
ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν Θεὸν ἐν
13 ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς. Ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει
14 διὰ τὸν Κύριον· εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν
ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον

δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν· ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσίαν· ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς Θεοῦ δοῦλοι. πάντας τιμήσατε, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε, τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε.

Οἱ οἰκέται, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σκολιοῖς. τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις, εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν Θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχων ἀδίκως. ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ Θεῷ. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ· ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· ὃς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει, πάσχων οὐκ ἠπείλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως· ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν· οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε· ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.

II. 24. The question whether αὐτοῦ should be read after μώλωπι is somewhat perplexing. There is good MS. authority both on the side of inserting and of omitting the word, and the two oldest copies are on opposite sides, ℵ having the pronoun and B omitting. Tischendorf has the word in his text, and Tregelles on his margin. As very frequently, consideration of probabilities with regard to transcription gives little aid. It is hardly possible to say with decision whether it is more likely that a sense of grammatical propriety led to the leaving out of the redundant pronoun, or that a remembrance of αὐτοῦ, as it stands in LXX., in the very familiar passage cited by Peter (Isa. liii. 5), led to its being inserted in the apostle's relative clause, — the ear having become accustomed to the Hellenistic redundancy of expression, through its occasional occurrence elsewhere in N. T. Left to this line of inquiry, one might perhaps incline to think the former supposition on the whole the more probable. But there seems to be a preponderance of MS. testimony in favour of omitting the pronoun.

3 Ὁμοίως γυναῖκες, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν,
ἵνα καὶ εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν
2 ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται, ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν
3 ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν. ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἔξωθεν
ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως
4 ἱματίων κόσμος, ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν
τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν
5 ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ πολυτελές. οὕτως γάρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἅγιαι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς Θεὸν ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτὰς,
6 ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα· ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα, ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν.

7 Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως, συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γνῶσιν ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ, ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ συνκληρονόμοις χάριτος ζωῆς, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐνκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.

8 Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι,
9 εὔσπλαγχνοι, ταπεινόφρονες, μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας, τοὐναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες, ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονο-
10 μήσητε. Ὁ γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χείλη τοῦ
11 μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον· ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιη-
12 σάτω ἀγαθόν· ζητησάτω εἰρήνην καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν· ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους, καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν
13 αὐτῶν· πρόσωπον δὲ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά. Καὶ τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε;
14 ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι. Τὸν δὲ

III. 6. On the question between ὑπήκουσεν (ℵ A C) and ὑπήκουεν (B), see Commentary, *in loc.*

III. 7. Between συνκληρονόμοι and συνκληρονόμοις authorities are much divided. Either suits the structure of the sentence. The weight of the evidence of B and the Vulgate,—and also of ℵ, for though in its earliest form that MS. shows the *accusative* plural, this cannot well be anything else than a clerical error for the dative,—seems to prove that the dative was probably the original reading.

15 φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε, Κύριον δὲ
τὸν Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν· ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ
πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν
16 ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου, συνείδησιν
ἔχοντες ἀγαθήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε καταισχυνθῶσιν
οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφήν.
17 Κρεῖττον γὰρ ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ
18 Θεοῦ, πάσχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦντας. ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ
περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, ἵνα ὑμᾶς
προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ, θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς
19 δὲ πνεύματι· ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευ-
20 θεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, ἀπειθήσασίν ποτε, ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ
Θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε, κατασκευαζομένης
κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαὶ, διεσώ-
21 θησαν δι' ὕδατος. ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει
βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως

III. 18. For ἀπέθανεν (supported by ℵ A C and the early versions), B and three late uncial copies, with many cursives, read ἔπαθεν. Westcott and Hort, having ἀπέθανεν in their text, place the other in their margin. The similarity of the words in form, and the familiarity of them both, and practical equivalence, as here applied, obviously made confusion very easy. ⟨ In ii. 21 precisely the same question presents itself, — the preponderance of authority there, however, in favour of ἔπαθεν being quite decisive.⟩ Here the evidence for ἀπέθανεν preponderates. Its documentary support is greater; and, having regard to the specialties of this Epistle, it seems much more likely that a copyist would stumble from ἀπέθανεν into ἔπαθεν than *vice versa*, because, whilst ἀποθνήσκειν is not found elsewhere in the Epistle, πάσχειν is a markedly favourite word of the apostle, occurring oftener in this short letter than in the whole of Paul's writings. In ii. 21, 23, iv. 1, it is used with reference to Christ. The πάσχειν of the verse preceding the present also might most naturally lead a copyist to write ἔπαθεν.

For ὑμᾶς (supported by B and a number of cursives), ἡμᾶς is given by ℵ^{c} A C, two late uncials, and the majority of cursives. The versions are pretty equally divided. A preponderance of documentary authority is thus on the side of ἡμᾶς. But when probability with regard to transcriptional error is considered, the likelihood seems very decidedly to be that ὑμᾶς was the original reading. Into the easy, familiar, natural form in a connection like the present, "bring *us* to God," a copyist might most readily stumble,—into the singular and remote "*you*," only by a casual clerical error in an isolated case, which does not at all account for the wide diffusion of the reading.

ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεὸν, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ
22 Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν,
ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.
4 Χριστοῦ οὖν παθόντος σαρκὶ, καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν
2 ὁπλίσασθε, ὅτι ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπαυται ἁμαρτίαις, εἰς
τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ τὸν
3 ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιῶσαι χρόνον. ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρε-
ληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι,
πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις, οἰνοφλυγίαις,
4 κώμοις, πότοις, καὶ ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις· ἐν ᾧ ξενί-
ζονται, μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τῆς ἀσωτίας
5 ἀνάχυσιν, βλασφημοῦντες· οἳ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ ἑτοί-
6 μως ἔχοντι κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ
νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους
σαρκὶ, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι.
7 Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν. σωφρονήσατε οὖν καὶ
8 νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς· πρὸ πάντων τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς
ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος
9 ἁμαρτιῶν· φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ·
10 ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακο-
11 νοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος Θεοῦ· εἴ τις
λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ· εἴ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς
χορηγεῖ ὁ Θεός· ἵνα ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζηται ὁ Θεὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ

IV. 1. For *ἁμαρτίαις* (found in ℵ^{c} B), *ἁμαρτίας* is read by ℵ* A C and later MSS. The rendering of the Vulgate (*a peccatis*), and that of the Peshito Syriac, which is similar, sustain *ἁμαρτίαις*, there being no trace in the Greek copies of the *genitive* plural as a reading. That transcribers might most readily, by dropping the *iota*, change the somewhat peculiar construction with the dative into the familiar construction with the genitive, is obvious,—whilst the converse change is not at all likely.

IV. 5. For *ἔχοντι κρῖναι* (which is given by ℵ A and the MSS. generally), B, with probably C, and also a very few minor authorities, reads *κρίνοντι*. Westcott and Hort have put this latter in their text, while no other editors have even given it an alternative place on the margin, and Scrivener describes it as a "frigid gloss." The canon of difficulty is no doubt in its favour; yet, considering the somewhat anomalous, and, in its connection here, not very natural combination *τῷ ἑτοίμως κρίνοντι*,—and the fewness of the authorities which support the reading,—it seems likely that it has sprung, by error of some kind, out of the other.

Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.
12 *Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς*
πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινομένῃ, ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος·
13 *ἀλλὰ καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήμασιν χαί-*
ρετε, ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε
14 *ἀγαλλιώμενοι. Εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ,*
μακάριοι· ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πνεῦμα ἐφ'
15 *ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται. μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ*
16 *κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιὸς, ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος· εἰ δὲ ὡς*
Χριστιανὸς, μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ
17 *ὀνόματι τούτῳ. ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ*
τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ· εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος
18 *τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ; καὶ Εἰ ὁ*
δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ
19 *φανεῖται; ὥστε καὶ οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ*
Θεοῦ πιστῷ κτίστῃ παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν
ἀγαθοποιΐᾳ.
5 *Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συνπρεσβύτερος*
καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων, ὁ καὶ τῆς
2 *μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοινωνός· ποιμάνατε τὸ*
ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἑκουσίως
3 *κατὰ Θεὸν, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ προθύμως, μηδ' ὡς*

IV. 14. On additions to the text of this verse, which are found in some copies, see Commentary, *in loc.*

V. 2. Before *μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς*, A, with most of the later MSS. and the versions, reads *ἐπισκοποῦντες*, which ℵ B and some other authorities omit. In a passage like this, which no doubt was much quoted in hortatory addresses to church office-bearers, the participle was very apt to slip in,—giving, as it does, a certain rhetorical roundness to the sentence. That, if in the original text, it would have been omitted, is very improbable.

The words *κατὰ Θεόν*, after *ἑκουσίως*, have a much stronger claim to be regarded as genuine. They are supported by ℵ A and many later MSS., and by the Vulgate, Memphitic, and some other versions,—but omitted by B, the majority of the later MSS., and the Peshito Syriac. The words are not such as would be at all likely to slip into the text; whilst, on the other hand,—from their very grandeur, when viewed as exhibiting a model for pastoral care,—the use of them might readily be shrunk from in oral citation, and omission in MSS. might thus easily enough arise.

κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ
4 ποιμνίου· καὶ φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος κομιεῖσθε
5 τὸν ἀμαράντινον τῆς δόξης στέφανον. Ὁμοίως νεώτεροι,
ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις· πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινο-
φροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε· ὅτι Ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντι-
τάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.

6 Ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα
7 ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ, πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρί-
8 ψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν. Νήψατε,
γρηγορήσατε· ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ὡς λέων ὠρυόμε-
9 νος περιπατεῖ ζητῶν τίνα καταπιεῖν· ᾧ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ
τῇ πίστει, εἰδότες τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων τῇ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ
10 ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς πάσης
χάριτος, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν
Χριστῷ ὀλίγον παθόντας, αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει,
11 σθενώσει. αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

V. 8. On the reading *τίνα καταπιεῖν*, see Commentary, *in loc.*

V. 10. After *σθενώσει*, ℵ and the great body of MSS., supported by a number of versions, add *θεμελιώσει*. A B and the Vulgate, with a few minor authorities, omit it. This evidence for omission, though scanty, is very strong in quality. From the nature of the verse one may safely assume that in the early ages, as in our own time, it was much employed in sermons and in prayers,—this latter use, indeed, being proved by the large number of copies in which the verbs have received a petitionary form by being put in the optative. Now the natural tendency in oral citation and free application of a passage of a cumulative structure, such as this, is always, for supposed effectiveness, to add to the *cumulus*, not to diminish. Considering this fact, and the high authority of those copies which leave the word out, the great probability seems to be that it did not belong to the original text. The particular verb *θεμελιοῦν* might readily suggest itself, from its similarity in sense to the verbs used by the apostle, and from the remembrance of the way in which Paul has employed it in passages which also, no doubt, like the present, were familiar as quotations in homilies, Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 23.

V. 11. After *τοὺς αἰῶνας*, ℵ A, and most other authorities, add *τῶν αἰώνων*. B and a few others omit these words. Considering the great tendency to expansion in doxologies, and, in the present case, particularly the tendency to conform the language entirely to that of iv. 11 (a tendency showing itself at work in the beginning of our verse in the reading, found in very many copies, *ἡ δόξα καί* before *τὸ κράτος*), the likelihood is very strong that the shorter reading is the original.

12 Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογίζομαι,
δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα, παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην
13 εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ· εἰς ἣν στῆτε. Ἀσπάζεται
ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου.
14 Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης.

Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.

INTRODUCTION.

I.—GENUINENESS.

1. In its opening words the letter distinctly claims the Apostle Peter as its writer; and this claim is sustained by such abundant evidence, external and internal, that it cannot on any reasonable critical principles be impugned. With regard to no book in the New Testament is the proof of genuineness more thoroughly satisfying.

2. In the early Church the Epistle was universally accepted as by Peter. On this point the statement of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 3), based on an intimate acquaintance with the Christian literature of the first centuries, is quite express: *Πέτρου μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία, ἡ λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα, ἀνωμολόγηται· ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηνται συγγράμμασιν.*

The first reference which we find to the letter is that implied in the *δευτέραν* of the Second Epistle (iii. 1), a document which, whether its genuineness is admitted or not, is unquestionably of very early date: *ταύτην ἤδη, ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν.*

Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians (§ 59), has *ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς*,—which cannot well be doubted to be from 1 Pet. ii. 9, especially when we find Clement in another passage (§ 36) using the full expression about the light: *ἡ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς.*

In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (i. 4) the precept

ἀπέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν καὶ σωματικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν seems clearly to have for its basis 1 Pet. ii. 11.

The passages just quoted from Clement and from the *Διδαχή* can hardly be called absolutely *certain* reminiscences of Peter, though their being such is probable in a very high degree. But in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians there are several quite indisputable quotations. In § 1 we find *εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ*, from 1 Pet. i. 8; in § 2, *πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόντα αὐτῷ δόξαν*, from 1 Pet. i. 21, and *μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας*, from 1 Pet. iii. 9; in § 8, *ὃς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ*, from 1 Pet. ii. 24, 22.

Of Polycarp's contemporary Papias we are told by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 39): *κέχρηται δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως.*

Besides those passages which have now been quoted from Clement, the *Διδαχή*, and Polycarp, there are also in others of the very early Christian writings—the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle to Diognetus, the *Shepherd* of Hermas, and the Homily of unknown authorship formerly called the Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians—probable reminiscences of the First Epistle of Peter; the most striking of which, as also some from the writers already cited, will be found mentioned in the notes on the various passages apparently referred to.

The early Gnostic Basilides says (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 12): *ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατάδικοι ἐπὶ κακοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις πάθωσι, μηδὲ λοιδορούμενοι ὡς ὁ μοιχὸς ἢ ὁ φονεύς, ἀλλ' ὅτι χριστιανοὶ πεφυκότες, ὅπερ αὐτοὺς παρηγορήσει μηδὲ πάσχειν δοκεῖν*,—a passage which one can hardly doubt to have had for its basis 1 Pet. iv. 14–16.

The persecuted Christians of Vienne and Lyons say in their Epistle (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 2): *ἐταπείνουν ἑαυτοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν*

κραταιὰν χεῖρα, ὑφ' ἧς ἱκανῶς νῦν εἰσὶν ὑψωμένοι, from 1 Pet. v. 6.

Irenæus is the first who attaches the writer's name to his quotations from the Epistle. In iv. 9. 2 : Petrus ait in epistola sua,—"Quem non videntes diligitis," inquit, "in quem nunc non videntes credidistis, gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili," from 1 Pet. i. 8 ; in iv. 16. 5 : Propter hoc Petrus ait, "non velamentum malitiæ habere nos libertatem," from 1 Pet. ii. 16.

From this point it is unnecessary to give quotations, because the free use of the Epistle, with the apostle's name attached, by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and the Fathers generally, shows that in every part of the Church it was unhesitatingly received as genuine.

In the very earliest versions of the New Testament, the Old Latin and Syriac, the Epistle was included.

In the Muratorian Fragment on the Canon it is not mentioned. Since, as we have seen, there is ample proof of the full acceptance of the Epistle long before any date to which, with the least likelihood, the composition of this list can be referred, the omission is probably to be explained by the supposition—to which the character of the document and the condition of the extant copy give every support—either that a sentence has been accidentally left out in translating from the original Greek, or that at the first the list was somewhat defective in its structure. See the thorough discussion on this subject in Westcott, *On the Canon.*

3. With the position so abundantly sustained by external proof, that the letter is a genuine production of the Apostle Peter, everything in it perfectly accords. It breathes throughout the spirit of quiet dignity, and shows everywhere the spiritual wisdom, the richness of tender sympathy, the aptness to teach, which are reasonably to be looked for in a writing from the hand of an apostle of Christ.

4. Some interesting and striking coincidences of thought and expression are found between the Epistle and the discourses of Peter recorded in the Book of Acts. Comp. i. 21

with Acts iii. 16; ii. 7 with Acts iv. 11; ii. 24 with Acts v. 30, x. 39; iv. 5 with Acts x. 42. The first of these cases is particularly striking, the resemblance being in a somewhat peculiar thought; *τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστούς* in the Epistle, *ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ* in Acts.

5. There are in the Epistle, also, modes of expression which tend to show that the writer had personally known the Lord Jesus, and which are of so incidental and indirect a character, that *design* to produce the impression of our having autoptic testimony is out of the question. In i. 8 the use of *οὐκ* with the aorist participle *ἰδόντες*, and of *μὴ* with the present *ὁρῶντες*, sets forth the "not having seen Christ" simply objectively, as a fact, but the "not seeing Him now," as a fact viewed in subjective relations. It is hardly conceivable that this little distinction would have been made except by one to whom it came instinctively, through the fact that the "not having seen the Lord" had for him *no* direct subjective relations, as he *had* seen Him,—whilst the "not seeing Him now" was an experience common to writer and readers. Again, in iii. 22 the participial statement, *πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν*, is really implied in the previous clause, *ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ*, and it is hard to imagine that it would, in such a sentence, have found expression by itself, except from a writer to whom, in connection with the thought of the Lord's being "at the right hand of God," memory immediately brought up, with vivid power, His departure from the Mount of Olives to heaven, as a scene at which he himself was present. The mode, too, in which the Saviour's sufferings, and His demeanour under them, are described, leads a reader irresistibly to the thought of the action of memory. "The meek conduct of Jesus, His silent endurance of all revilings and accusations, His quiet patience, even unto the cross (i. 19, ii. 21–24, iii. 18),—all this is described *in such a manner* that we involuntarily get the impression of an eye-witness" (Lechler, *Apost. and Post-Apost. Times*, E. T vol. ii. p. 158).

6. The Petrine authorship of the Epistle does not seem to have been disputed till the rise of the modern destructive school of criticism. The Paulicians, an Oriental sect of the eighth and ninth centuries, kindred to the Manicheans, set aside the Epistle through hatred of the apostle or of his doctrine (*pessime adversus illum affecti*, as the contemporary chronicler, Petrus Siculus, has it); but not the slightest hint is given that they doubted Peter to be the writer. By the Tübingen critics the authorship has been denied, mainly on the ground of the obvious familiarity of the writer with letters of the Apostle Paul, and his manifest harmony with Paul in doctrine. Thus Schwegler says, "The Epistle is an attempt of a disciple of Paul to reconcile the Pauline and Petrine parties, by putting into Peter's mouth a testimony to Paul's soundness in the faith, along with a statement of the Pauline system of doctrine, coloured somewhat through the views of Peter" (*Nachapost. Zeitalter*, vol. ii. p. 22). This admitted want of discord between our Epistle and the Epistles of Paul has weight against the Petrine authorship, of course, only with persons who concede the fundamental position of the critical structure associated specially with the names of Baur and his school—namely, that Paul and the apostles of the circumcision were keenly opposed to each other in doctrine and in feeling. A few years ago it would have been needful, in the Introduction to a critical commentary on 1 Peter, to discuss this question with some fulness; but the impression produced by the boldness, learning, and dialectic skill of the Tübingen scholars has now to a great extent passed away. Any measure of belief that the Clementine romance of the latter half of the second century exhibits the course of the history of the primitive Church more faithfully than the Acts of the Apostles, and the writings of Clement of Rome, and Polycarp, and Justin, is now confined to a very small circle. Even by critics of strongly negative tendencies it has been recognised that the Tübingen position with respect to the divisions of the primitive Church is utterly untenable. Keim, for ex-

ample, in his last work, *Aus dem Urchristenthum*,—published in 1878, a short time before his death,—enters fully into a discussion of the supposed data in Scripture for Baur's conclusions, and shows these data to have been obtained only by misinterpretations and fallacies. Schenkel, too, in his *Das Christusbild der Apostel und der nachapostolischen Zeit*, published in 1879, expresses his utter disbelief in the Tübingen doctrine. The same ground, or ground nearly the same, has been reached by Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker, Renan, and others. Thus, now, in discussing the genuineness of the Epistle, the objection that anything in what is known, or probably supposed, with respect to Peter's theological views, or his relations to the Apostle Paul, is inconsistent with his having written this letter, may quite reasonably be regarded as already obsolete and out of the way.

7. Exception has been taken by some to the claim of the Epistle to have been written by Peter, on the ground that it contains little which is not abundantly taught in the New Testament elsewhere, and thus lacks the independence and originality which are to be looked for in a document coming from the hand of an eminent apostle. To this objection the answer is obvious. The test or standard proposed—that every apostolic writing must abound in strictly new teaching—is a purely arbitrary one. The only positions on this subject which are not arbitrary, but plainly sustained by what we know of the commission and special qualifications of the apostles, are such as these,—that, without doubt, in writing letters to the Churches, as in preaching sermons to them, the apostles had definite aims with respect to giving their brethren spiritual help,—that, if the satisfactory attainment of the special spiritual aim of the writer required the announcement of truth previously hidden, then this truth was made known,—and that in every case, whether a letter contained new revelations or not, certainly by a fresh divinely-taught mode of presenting truth in suitable aspects and relations the Church had ministered to it richly the particular aid which was

intended. Regarding the First Epistle of Peter the testimony of the Church of all ages has been most explicit, that, applying to it the tests based on these reasonable and scriptural principles, it has found nothing in the document but what is most fully accordant with its claim to be an apostolic writing. With various minor objects, the special aim of the Epistle is plainly to cheer and strengthen the believer amid difficulty and trial, by bringing vividly before him the truth of a wise and loving Father's providence, and brightening his path with the light of hope. Every spiritually-minded reader feels that the letter fulfils this design in a measure which can be ascribed only to the wisdom of heaven. To no portion of the Bible, probably—with the single exception of the Lord's parting address to His disciples on the eve of His Passion—does a Christian, when sorely tried, more naturally turn for guidance and comfort than to this Epistle. Its wealth of consolation sustains the heart; and at every point, too, the calm authoritativeness and dignity of the utterance accord perfectly with its claim to have been written by the Apostle Peter.

8. From two statements in the Epistle arguments have been drawn against the Petrine authorship. One of these statements is that found in the superscription, that the Churches to which the letter was written were those in Asia Minor,—Churches which are known to have been founded by the Apostle Paul or his associates. "It is improbable," says Dr. Samuel Davidson (*Introduction to Study of N. T.*, vol. i. p. 425), "that Peter should write to the Churches of Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, which Paul had founded and instructed; at least while the apostle himself was alive." It certainly is *prima facie* improbable; and just for that reason it is much more likely that the letter which has, as a matter of fact, come down to us from early times addressed to those Asiatic Churches, and distinctly claiming to be by Peter was actually written by him, than that it was from the hand of an impostor. The unlikelihood of Peter's writing to these

Churches is so obvious, that an impostor would certainly not have gratuitously burdened his task with this obstruction in the way of having his imposture accepted; whereas circumstances may most easily be conceived of a kind to make it perfectly natural for Peter to send these Churches a letter. This point is dealt with in § III.

9. The other statement in the letter from which an objection to the validity of its claim to be by the Apostle Peter has been derived is that made in iv. 16, that, at the time it was written, the simple name of "Christian" was a ground of accusation before courts of law. It has been maintained that this points to a considerably later date than Peter's lifetime. Admitting that—as Paul's experience, for example, in Ephesus, Philippi, and elsewhere proved—Christians were liable from the beginning, in any part of the empire, to persecution in various forms, through outbreaks of popular fanaticism, or through false accusations raised by private foes, it is held, at the same time, that persecution taking the shape of bringing a man to the tribunal charged simply with *being a Christian* was possible only after an Imperial edict expressly prohibiting Christianity had been issued; which, it is said, was not till Trajan's time, in the beginning of the second century.

There are serious flaws in this argument. There appears to be no sufficient basis for the assertion that an edict was needed to make the profession of Christianity a ground of accusation and of punishment. The principle of the Romans was, that unless a religion was expressly *sanctioned*, it was illegal. Judaism was a *religio licita*, and for a considerable number of years Christianity had the protection afforded by the fact that it was held to be merely a form of Judaism. But as soon as it was seen that, in some important respects, Judaism and Christianity were distinct from each other, then *ipso facto* Christianity was a forbidden system; and whilst, no doubt, the putting of the law in force might be but occasional, due to local and temporary influences, yet a magistrate could

not constitutionally refuse to receive a charge made against a man of being a Christian, if such an accusation were formally raised at his judgement-seat. In fact, that very correspondence between Pliny and Trajan, from which the definite illegality of Christianity is by those scholars who raise this objection to the Petrine authorship of the Epistle supposed to date, itself shows clearly that the case was not so, but that Pliny found judicial dealing with Christians, simply as Christians, already in action when he went to his province. Pliny's language leaves on this point no doubt whatever: "Sollemne est mihi, domine, omnia de quibus dubito ad te referre. Quis enim potest melius vel cunctationem meam regere, vel ignorantiam extruere? Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam: ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quæri. Nec mediocriter hæsitavi sitne aliquod discrimen ætatum an quamlibet teneri nihil a robustioribus differant,—detur pœnitentiæ venia an ei qui omnino Christianus fuit desisse non prosit,—nomen ipsum, si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohærentia nomini puniantur. Interim in iis qui ad me tanquam Christiani deferebantur hunc sum secutus modum. Interrogavi ipsos an essent Christiani. Confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogavi, supplicium minatus: perseverantes duci jussi." Trajan's reply also most distinctly assumes that there was no question in hand of making a new law prohibiting Christianity or enjoining persecution. Quite plainly the law continued as it had been, the wise and humane emperor merely introducing some mitigations.

How long Christians had been liable in this way to persecution, and whether the state of things was due to an edict of some former emperor, expressly condemning Christianity, or had been brought about merely through the fact that the profession of this religion had not been expressly authorized, we cannot tell. By far the most probable date for the beginning of judicial dealing with men simply on the ground of being Christians, is the reign of Nero. It is likely enough that, in connection with the persecution which followed the

great fire, that emperor issued an edict prohibiting Christianity, though this has not been recorded. At all events it cannot well be doubted that, at the time of his persecution, the Jews of Rome, in order to escape suffering along with the Christians, made strenuous endeavours to show clearly to the government, and to the people generally, the distinction between the two religious systems. There appears to be a great probability, therefore, that from the year 64 the profession of Christianity was, either as being definitely prohibited, or simply as being unsanctioned, criminal in the eyes of Roman law. Now various lines of evidence converge to fix the date of our Epistle a year or two later than 64. On the question dealt with in the present paragraph, Professor Salmon's *Introduction to N. T.*, pp. 543, 544, may be consulted, and particularly a characteristically thorough and satisfying discussion by Bp. Lightfoot, in his edition of Ignatius, vol. i. pp. 2–21.

II.—TO WHOM WRITTEN.

1. The Epistle is addressed (i. 1) to the Christians in certain districts of Asia Minor, the districts specified covering the whole of that region except the south coast.

The first division named is *Pontus*. Under what circumstances Christianity made its entrance into this province we have no information. Jews and proselytes from it are mentioned among those who were in Jerusalem at the ever-memorable Pentecost (Acts ii. 9); and by some of these knowledge of Christian truth may have been carried to their homes. Aquila, the friend of Paul, was a native of Pontus (Acts xviii. 2).

Of the preaching of the gospel by Paul in *Galatia*, the district next named, of the cordial reception which was given to him and to his teaching, and of the fickleness of spirit exhibited by many of his converts,—a trait so cha-

racteristic of the Gallic race to which they belonged,—full information is supplied in the apostle's letter to the Christians there.

From *Cappadocia*, which follows, there had been Jews at Jerusalem at Pentecost. No other mention of this province than that and the present is found in the New Testament. In later times its ecclesiastics included some of the most eminent of Christian bishops and writers,—Cæsarea, the See of Basil the Great, Nyssa, that of his brother Gregory, and Nazianzus, that of their common friend, the other Gregory, being all in Cappadocia.

Asia, by which here, as always in the New Testament, is meant the Roman province of that name, stretching along the west coast, included by this time many well-known Churches, —Ephesus, Colossæ, Laodicea, and others, — most of them founded by Paul or by his evangelistic helpers.

Of *Bithynia*, the last district named by the apostle, we hear little in the New Testament, the only other mention of it being a statement in Acts (xvi. 7), that Paul, immediately before his first mission to Europe, had a wish to visit this region, but was forbidden by the Spirit. In later times we find Christianity flourishing in this province. It was with regard to it that in the year 112 Pliny the younger, at that time the governor, wrote his famous letter to Trajan, in which he describes the extraordinary progress of the new religion. "Multi omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam," as he mentions, were accused before the magistrates on the charge of being Christians; further, "neque civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros, superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est;" and yet further, with regard to the power of this new faith in the way of diminishing the attention paid by the people to the heathen worship, "prope jam desolata templa—et sacra sollemnia diu intermissa," whilst of animals offered for sale in the markets to be sacrificed to the gods, there had been for some time but "rarissimus emptor." In Bithynia, too, was the city of Nicæa, where, in 325, met the

memorable Œcumenical Council which condemned the Arian heresy.

2. The language of the superscription of the Epistle, *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου* κτλ., suggests at first sight that it was addressed, not to the Christians generally who lived in the districts named, but to those of them who were of the Jewish race. In a simple piece of prose writing like this, the genitive *διασπορᾶς* cannot naturally be taken (as in the Authorized English Version) as equivalent to the participle *διεσπαρμένοις*. Considering that for many generations this word *διασπορά* had been employed in a special way as the designation of that portion of the Jewish race who lived beyond the bounds of Canaan, their covenant home (cf. Jer. xxxiv. 17, LXX.; Judith v. 19; 2 Macc. i. 27; John vii. 35; Jas. i. 1), there cannot well be a doubt that, as used by Peter here, it has this meaning, "the scattered ones of the house of Israel."

3. But investigation into the precise thought which was intended by the apostle in using the expression does not quite end here. In the body of the Epistle nothing presents itself which seems specially applicable to Jewish Christians, nothing of such specialty of teaching as we find in the Epistle of James and in that to the Hebrews. Not merely is no subject discussed which we can suppose to have been, from their peculiar history, or ritual, or temptations, more interesting or important to them than to converts from heathenism; but no clause or phrase even seems to have any unquestionable special suitableness for them. The expression *ἡ ματαία ὑμῶν ἀναστροφὴ πατροπαράδοτος* (i. 18) has been by some thought of as having a special applicability to Jews; but, in truth, it has an equally natural and full reference to the empty, profitless modes of thought and life handed down by one generation of heathen to another. The use of *τὰ ἔθνη* also, in ii. 12 and iv. 3, has been supposed to discriminate those addressed in the letter from the Gentiles; but there is clear proof that, as was most natural, the word

ἔθνη began very early in the history of the Christian Church to have the reference to *religion* so prominent in it that reference to *race* was often quite in the background. We find such to be the case in the apostolic Epistles. Except where there is special and manifest reference to the distinction of the Jews from other nations, Greeks and Romans who have accepted Christ are not thought and spoken of as "Gentiles." In writing to Churches mainly composed of converts from heathenism, Paul employs ἔθνη in such a way that the converts are quite clearly not included; see, for example, 1 Thess. iv. 5; Eph. iv. 17 (true reading).

Whilst thus there is nothing in the Epistle which appears to be specially suitable for Jewish Christians, there are modes of expression which seem more naturally addressed to converts from heathenism. The most striking passage of this kind is iv. 3. The whole of the catalogue of vices there mentioned is much more characteristic of the heathen than of the Jews of that age, so far as we know anything of the kind of sins by which they were usually marked; and the ἀθέμιτοι εἰδωλολατρίαι cannot at all be ascribed to Jews, except in a metaphorical sense, such as is not in the least suggested by the context. Such expressions as οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαός, too (ii. 10), and ἧς (Sarah's) ἐγενήθητε τέκνα (iii. 6), while in a measure applicable to all Christians, yet have decidedly more special applicability to converts from heathenism than to Jewish believers.

4. With regard to the address of the letter, looked at in the light of these facts, various views may be entertained. We may hold that the apostle writes in the first instance to the Christian converts from Judaism, and occasionally speaks somewhat specially to those of them who originally had been heathen, but at the time of their conversion to Christ had been Jewish proselytes,—with whom may be also naturally enough conjoined persons who had entered the Christian Church directly from heathenism. Or we may hold that Peter, being well known everywhere as one of those apostles

who laboured mainly in the Jewish field, might judge it a matter of kindly courtesy to acknowledge at the outset a specially close relation to those of the Asiatic believers who were his brethren after the flesh, while really intending the letter for the whole body of Christians, and anticipating that, when it was read, its tenor would soon show this.

Neither of these suppositions seems perfectly adequate to explain the facts in the case. The most natural and satisfactory view appears to be that the letter was intended for, and is really addressed to, all the Christians, of whatever nationality,—the apostle's form of expression *παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς* being employed in a secondary sense, and gathering up all the believers as the *spiritual* Israel. From the Septuagint rendering of David's words in Ps. xxxix. (xxxviii. Sept.) 12,—a quotation and spiritual application of Abraham's statement to the children of Heth (Gen. xxiii. 4),—*πάροικος ἐγώ εἰμι παρὰ σοὶ καὶ παρεπίδημος, καθὼς πάντες οἱ πατέρες μου*, we see that the word *παρεπίδημος* was early in use to represent the believer's life on earth, with its alien surroundings for the citizen of heaven, its foreign language, foreign manners, foreign views and feelings. In the only passages of the New Testament besides the present where the word occurs (ii. 11; Heb. xi. 13) this is its use. One of these passages, it will be observed, is in our Epistle; and elsewhere, too, the apostle gives evidence how vividly he had this pilgrim aspect of the Christian life before his mind (see i. 17). With regard to *διασπορά*, also, the tenor of the Epistle affords reason for doubt whether it is not to be taken with a secondary rather than with the primary reference. In the course of the letter, the fact that the great Catholic Church of the New Dispensation—the Church in which the distinction between Jew and Greek is lost—is the spiritual Israel, the body by whom the realization of all the covenant promises to Abraham's seed is enjoyed in glorious fulness, is illustrated by the apostle in considerable detail by the application to Christians of the Old Testament

descriptions of Israel, "a chosen nation," "a royal priesthood," and the like (ii. 5, 9, 10). *Διασπορά* in the first verse, then, may be supposed to be so employed as, at the very beginning, to point to this position of Christians, — the combination *παρεπίδημοι διασπορᾶς* meaning "sojourners, or pilgrims, of the scattered spiritual Israel."

It may appear somewhat unnatural to attach a spiritual reference to words of this kind occurring in the address of a letter, a position where, as a rule, not figurative language, but the plainest and most business-like, is in place. Closer examination, however, removes or, at least, greatly modifies this feeling with respect to the present case. It can hardly be questioned that the one term, *παρεπιδήμοις*, is most naturally taken with a spiritual reference. This was evidently the ordinary use of the word among believers, and, if taken here literally, it appears to come in cumbrously and, indeed, tautologically, in place of the simple *τοῖς ἐν διασπορᾷ*, or James's *ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*. It is interesting, too, to notice that—whether simply through the influence of the same feeling which our apostle appears to have had here, or directly suggested by this passage—in the immediately post-apostolic age the mention of the pilgrim life entered not unfrequently into the superscription of public religious letters, — as in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, that of Polycarp to the Philippians, and that of the Church of Smyrna about the martyrdom of Polycarp. Seeing, then, the obvious familiarity of the early Christians with the thought that their life on earth was a pilgrimage, and considering the fact that *παρεπίδημος* was a word commonly employed among them to express this thought,— such, indeed, being with them, as New Testament usage suggests, its ordinary application,—we may fairly assume that, on the occurrence of the word in the heading of this Epistle, the spiritual reference at once presented itself to the apostle's readers as that which was intended by him. They might not unnaturally also carry forward this reference into

the next and closely kindred term *διασπορᾶς*,—holding this word indeed, perhaps, in the first instance as somewhat ambiguous, but soon made certain of the reference by the catholicity of the tone of the letter, and particularly by that application of Old Testament designations of Israel to the Christian Church which has been already spoken of.

5. In a dissertation, published in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (January 1861), Dr. Quarry maintains that the Epistle is addressed to *Roman* Christians who, under the pressure of Nero's persecution, had fled from the city and taken refuge in Asia Minor. This position has the great weight also of Prof. Salmon's authority (*Introd. N. T.* p. 551), thus far, at least, that he "feels much inclined" to adopt it. Of Dr. Quarry's argument, the main point is that 2 Pet. iii. 15 contains a distinct reference to Rom. ii. 4 (a view in which he is supported by Grotius, Neander, and others), and that the words *ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν* are to be taken *strictly*. The proof thus afforded, that the Second Epistle was written to Roman Christians, is valid also for the First,—2 Ep. iii. 1 showing that the two were written to the same persons. This argument, though supported by Dr. Quarry with much ingenuity, does not seem really very strong. The reference in 2 Pet. iii. 15 is not by any means *certainly* to a passage in Romans, and, even if it were, there is no necessity for taking the expression, "wrote to you," in the narrow sense demanded by Dr. Quarry; but, on the contrary, nothing in the least forced in viewing it as said to natives of Asia who had *read* the Epistle to the Romans,—all Scripture being really intended for and practically addressed to all to whom it comes, whoever might be the first recipients of the particular portion.

Thus weak, as regards positive support, Dr. Quarry's position is confronted also with serious difficulties. Besides the objections which present themselves (see § IV. of this Introduction) to taking "Babylon" in chap. v. 13 to mean Rome,—an interpretation needful to give anything of

likelihood to the view,—the proposed application of the word *διασπορά* to a body of fugitive Romans is not very natural. Dr. Quarry feels this, and makes a somewhat desperate attempt to obtain an analogy, by proposing to explain the words *τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, in John vii. 35, as "the scattered Gentiles," in place of "the (Jewish) dispersion among the Gentiles." According to the ordinary view of the meaning of these words, the use of the genitive is, no doubt, a little peculiar, though not very different from that of *Πόντου* κτλ. in the first verse of our Epistle; but the proposed interpretation makes *διασποράν* practically unmeaning. A yet more weighty objection than any which is merely linguistic, to the view that the persons addressed by Peter were fugitives from Rome, lies in the fact that in the two Epistles not a single expression occurs which can be supposed with any naturalness to refer to flight, or to previous residence in Italy; whilst, on the other hand, there are references which naturally suggest that the persons addressed had been for a considerable time settled residents in the region where they lived. Such, for example, are (1 Ep. ii. 18 foll.) the mention of slaves, not fugitives from their masters, nor fugitives along with Christian masters, but owned by persons who were cruel to them; and (iii. 1) the mention of wives, not fugitives along with Christian husbands, but living at the time with non-Christian husbands.

6. On the whole, the most probable view seems to be that the Epistle is addressed to the Christians generally who were resident in the districts named, the apostle's words describing them as being all spiritually "sojourners, or pilgrims, of the scattered Israel of God." The truth that *all* Christians, whatever their nationality, are spiritually of the seed of Abraham, must, long before the date of Peter's letter, have become familiar to the Asiatic believers to whom he wrote, through references to the subject in Paul's Epistles to Churches among them; see, for example, Gal. iii. 29, iv. 28; Col. ii. 11.

III.—OCCASION AND DATE.

1. Of the Churches throughout a large part of the area covered by the provinces named in the superscription of the Epistle, we know certainly, from statements in Acts and in the Pauline Epistles, that they were founded by Paul, or by evangelists labouring in special association with him. With respect to the Churches in the rest of the region also, it is highly probable, considering the abundant communication between the different districts of Asia Minor, that they originated through the efforts of assistants or converts of Paul. In Peter's letter there is no allusion necessitating or naturally leading to the supposition that he had any personal acquaintance with the Christian brethren whom he addresses. He knew their circumstances in a general way, but apparently merely by report. That the apostle ever visited those parts, there is no satisfactory evidence. Origen, Eusebius, and other Fathers, indeed, speak of his having done so; but their language is of a vague kind, such as to suggest that what they say is not based on information, but was merely an inference from the occurrence of the names of the Asiatic provinces at the head of the Epistle.

2. What led to Peter's writing to the Christians in those districts we can only conjecture. The way in which, in v. 12, Silvanus is spoken of makes it a somewhat likely supposition that this evangelist — possibly, and not improbably, the Silvanus or Silas who was for a time a fellow-labourer of Paul, and that in Asia as well as other parts—had, after a missionary tour through those districts, visited Peter, and given him an account of the condition of the Churches; and that the apostle was thus led to send to them some words of Christian instruction and cheer through Silvanus when he went back.

Many years previously, as we know, an arrangement regarding division of labour had been made among the apostles, to the effect that Peter and some of the others

should devote their energies mainly to the Jews, and Paul and his associates should give theirs mainly to work among the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 9). This, however, was not at all intended—no such arrangement among Christian men could, in any circumstances, possibly be intended—as absolute in its character. The aim of these brethren was not to make men followers of Paul or of Peter, but of Christ; and accordingly the apostles of the circumcision, and the apostle of the Gentiles and his companions, respectively, felt themselves in no way restrained from going for a time out of their own special province, if they saw that the interests of the great common cause called for their doing so. Wherever, in his travels, Paul found Jews, his first offer of Christ was made to them. There are very strong grounds, too,—the adverse criticism of Weiss, Lechler, and others notwithstanding,—for thinking that the Epistle specially addressed to the Hebrew believers came from the Pauline group of evangelists, whoever was the particular writer. That Peter again should, when occasion seemed to him to call for it, write a letter of brotherly counsel to Churches mainly composed of Gentile converts,—such as the references in Acts and the Pauline Epistles lead us to think most of these Churches of Asia Minor must have been,—was a most natural thing in the apostle who had been specially chosen by God to begin, in the house of Cornelius, the direct preaching of the gospel to the uncircumcision.

3. Considering the very close and tender relations which these Churches of Asia held to the Apostle Paul, it is obviously probable in a high degree that, when Peter wrote them a letter of religious counsel and stimulus, Paul, their special guide, to whom in the first instance they would naturally have looked for such a communication, was known by his brother apostle to be at the time not in a position to do the needed work. The thought occurs that from this we may obtain some indication of the date of the Epistle. The hint thus afforded, however, is altogether vague; and neither by it nor by any-

thing in the letter are we enabled to determine the date to a particular year.

It does not seem very likely that the writing of the letter is to be placed after the death of Paul. Both that apostle and Peter, according to statements of the Fathers which cannot well be doubted, suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero. Now the data which we have in the pastoral Epistles and in these patristic statements, appear to put Paul's death near the close of Nero's reign, so near the close as to make it scarcely probable that Peter survived his friend long enough for us reasonably to place the writing of the Epistle in that time,—at all events if we take the "Babylon," from which it was written (v. 13), to be the distant city on the Euphrates, and if we also accept the genuineness of the *Second* Epistle, written, as it would seem, after a considerable interval. Assuming, then, both the apostles to have been alive at the time when our Epistle was written, we may suppose that Peter knew Paul to be at the time unable to hear of the condition of his Asiatic converts or to send them a communication,—being occupied, it may be, on some very distant missionary expedition, fulfilling, perhaps, his long-formed intention of visiting Spain (Rom. xv. 24, 28; cf. also Clem. Rom. § 5). On the whole, it seems more likely that the letter was written under some such circumstances than that it belongs to the time after Paul's death. Be this as it may, however, it can hardly be doubted, at all events, that the date of the letter falls between the end of the year 64 and the year 68. To this period a number of facts lead us. The limit in the one direction is 68, because in that year Nero's reign ended. To or towards the end of 64, as the earliest time when we can think of the letter as having been written, several lines of proof converge. The acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans which is shown in Peter's letter (see § V.) makes the date certainly not before the year 58; and, if knowledge also of the Epistle to the Ephesians be admitted,—which is, at the least, probable,—this carries us

forward to the year 61 or 62. Again, of Paul's life between the time of his first missionary visit to Central Asia Minor and the year 63 we have a detailed narrative in Acts; and no period presents itself within that time when it seems likely that another apostle would have written to the Churches there. Now of his history between the time of his release from the first Roman imprisonment and his martyrdom we know nothing except what we gather from the pastoral Epistles; and circumstances may most easily have occurred then which made it natural and fitting that Peter should write to Paul's converts. Yet again, that the Epistle was not written earlier than the latter part of the year 64, is made highly probable by the references in it to persecution of fiery severity (iv. 12 foll.), and particularly by the intimation given in iv. 16, that the simple profession of Christianity was at the time recognised by the magistrates in Asia Minor as a ground for a criminal charge. By far the most likely starting-point for this state of things appears, as has been shown in § I., to have been the persecution of the Christians in Rome, begun in 64 after the great fire. Certainly the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians give no hint that at the time they were written (61 or 62) there was persecution in Asia Minor. On the whole, therefore, it seems that we may safely date the Epistle between 64 and 68 A.D.

Besides the grounds for this judgement which have been already stated, some little additional support seems to be given to it by the apostle's reference in v. 13 to "Marcus" as sending greetings. Remembering the intimate relations with Peter which early writers—Papias, Irenæus, and others—ascribe to Mark the evangelist, who is almost certainly to be identified with John Mark, the cousin of Barnabas and associate at various times of Paul, it seems most likely that we are to recognise him in this Marcus. From the fact of his specially sending salutations to the Churches of Asia Minor, we may naturally deem it at least not improbable

that he had become acquainted with some of them. Now in Colossians (iv. 10)—an Epistle written during the *first* Roman imprisonment—we find that Mark, then with Paul in Rome, had thoughts of visiting Asia Minor; and in 2nd Timothy, the last of Paul's letters, written during the *second* Roman imprisonment, we learn (iv. 11) that Mark then *was* in Asia Minor. It is obvious that the supposition of his having gone from Asia Minor to Babylon at some time during those years, to join Peter there in his labours for a season, fits in with all the data.

4. By one or two of the older scholars an early date for the Epistle was thought of, about 46 or 48 A.D.; and recently it has been maintained by Weiss that it was written before the Apostle Paul's influence was much felt in Asia Minor,—certainly, therefore, before the year 54, when the apostle's third missionary tour began, which left such a deep impress on all that region (Acts xviii. 23, xix. 1–20). The improbabilities involved in this view, with respect to the existence of fully-organized Christian Churches over a large part of Asia Minor before Paul's third journey,—with respect to the similarities between this Epistle and some of the Pauline letters, the original writer, according to Weiss, being, of course, Peter, and Paul the secondary,—and especially with respect to the subjection of Christianity at that early time to formal legalized persecution,—these improbabilities are so great that this view of the date can hardly but be ascribed less to calm consideration of facts than to *à priori* theorizing.

IV.—PLACE WHERE WRITTEN.

1. In v. 13 the apostle sends the salutations of "the Church that is at Babylon;" from which it is naturally inferred that, when he wrote the letter, he was himself either in that city or in the immediate neighbourhood.

To our giving the name "Babylon" here the reference

which *prima facie* suggests itself to every reader, to the famous city on the Euphrates, there does not lie any serious objection in the fact that no ancient writer speaks of Peter's having visited Babylonia; because with respect to his scenes of labour during the whole of the latter part of his life we are entirely without trustworthy information. No region was more likely to be visited by an apostle who had it as his special work to "go to the circumcision;" seeing that for many generations a multitude of Jews had been resident in those parts.

Some doubt, however, has been entertained by scholars whether the well-known Babylon can be meant in this passage, from the fact that, as Josephus tells us (*Antiq.* xviii. 9. § 8), during the reign of Caius Cæsar many of the Jews of Babylon were led, through hostility of the heathen and through pestilence, to migrate from that city, now greatly decayed, to the flourishing neighbouring city of Seleucia. There is not much force in this, however. The language of the historian does not necessarily imply that the whole Jewish population left Babylon; and supposing that it did imply this, more than twenty years had elapsed between the time of the migration spoken of and the period at which, with any likelihood, the writing of this Epistle can be fixed,—an interval long enough to allow of a renewal of the Jewish element in the population sufficient to invite the apostle's labours.

2. Influenced, however, by this supposed difficulty in the way of taking the well-known Babylon to be meant, many expositors have looked elsewhere for the place which Peter so names. Several purely arbitrary conjectures on the subject have been made, which need not be discussed. To the claims of two places a certain measure of plausibility attaches. One of these is a small town in the Delta of Egypt, the other is the city of Rome.

3. In favour of the former of these, little can be said except simply that, beyond question, the place bore the name

of Babylon,—in consequence, as tradition asserted, of its having been built by natives of the great Eastern Babylon, who had come to Egypt in the expedition of Cambyses, or earlier. Egypt, too, no doubt—extensively occupied as it was by Jews—was perhaps as likely as Babylonia to be visited by the Apostle Peter; and tradition associates the name of the evangelist Mark—probably the "Marcus my son" of chap. v. 13 of our Epistle—with the founding of the Church of Alexandria. But nothing which is known of this Egyptian Babylon leads one to suppose it a place where Jews were likely to be found in any considerable numbers, or which on any ground was fitted to attract the special attention of the apostle. Moreover, though, from the time of the Emperor Augustus, it had some provincial importance as a military station, we have no reason whatever to think that it was much known out of Egypt; and the great probability is that of those Christians of Asia Minor to whom Peter wrote, only a very few, who had family or commercial connections with Egypt, knew of the existence of this town. It is therefore unlikely in a very high degree that, supposing the apostle to have written his letter from this little place in Egypt, he would, without any minute specification, have used a name which would certainly convey a wrong impression of where he was, and of what Church it was whose Christian salutations he sent.

4. In favour of the claim of Rome to have been the scene of the apostle's labours at the time when he wrote the Epistle, the following arguments present themselves:—*First*, The name of the great city which so grievously oppressed the Church of God under the old economy was a most fitting symbolical one for the great city which oppressed the Christian Church. *Secondly*, The "Babylon" of the Book of Revelation has been generally identified with Rome. *Thirdly*, According to patristic tradition, Peter did visit Rome, and, whilst much which is demonstrably false has gathered round the original nucleus, yet the *consensus* of a large number of early authori-

ties makes it hardly possible to doubt that he did suffer martyrdom there, and may not improbably have been in the city for some time previously. *Fourthly*, By early Fathers—as Papias and Clement of Alexandria (or possibly Papias *or* Clement, for the passage of Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 15, which is our authority on the point, is a little vague) and Jerome—the name "Babylon" in this Epistle was believed to designate Rome. Through the influence of these considerations, the position that Peter wrote the Epistle in Rome has been maintained by a great many scholars, including the Roman Catholic writers generally, and also a large number of Protestants—of quite recent writers, for example, Godet (*N. T. Studies*), Salmon (*Introduction to N. T.*), Cook (*Speaker's Commentary*), Mason (*Commentary for English Readers*, edited by Bishop Ellicott).

That a plausible case in favour of Rome is established there can be no doubt; yet the real argumentative force of the facts which have been mentioned appears to grow considerably less as one looks at them. Admitting that the apostle probably suffered martyrdom in Rome, he may yet quite well at the time of writing this letter have been in a region far distant from Rome; because the precise date of the letter is uncertain within several years. Again, a symbolical name, perfectly suitable and natural in a book of visions like the Apocalypse, does not seem to come in at all naturally in a quiet, business-like, unmystical statement like that in chap. v. 13 of our Epistle. It will be observed, too, that, on any reasonable view of the dates of the two books, the writing of the Epistle was almost certainly prior to that of the Apocalypse; and there is no evidence—nor, considering the history of the Church up to that time, any likelihood—that "Babylon" had already come to be known among the Christians as a designation of Rome. On the supposition under discussion, then, Peter, in a piece of calm unimpassioned prose, employed a familiar name in an altogether unfamiliar sense, without adding a word of explanation, or giving the slightest

hint that he was writing mystically. The patristic opinion, that the apostle's reference is to Rome, is of little moment; because, long before the time even of Papias, Rome had shown herself clearly as a cruel oppressor of the Church, and the Book of Revelation had made the symbolical sense of the name Babylon familiar to all Christians. In such circumstances the tradition of Peter's connection with Rome might most naturally lead to the thought that, in the name as employed in his Epistle also, the mystical meaning was to be recognised.

By Mason, Quarry, and others it is suggested that, supposing Rome to be meant by Babylon in our apostle's use of the name, the reason for his so speaking might be that at the time it was dangerous for him, or for the Roman Church, to have it known beyond the ranks of the believers in Christ where he was. The name was therefore disguised in such a way that while Christians—this peculiar use of "Babylon" being perhaps already known to them—might recognise what was intended, enemies, should a copy of the Epistle fall into their hands, would be led astray. This is as likely an explanation as could be given; and yet it is far-fetched, seeing that obviously, if such was the apostle's position, the simple course was open to him of saying nothing at all in the letter with respect to where he was, leaving it to his messenger, Silvanus, to give information on this subject should it seem needful or desirable to do so. Dr. Quarry ventures also the singular conjecture regarding the names Pontus, Cappadocia, and the rest at the beginning of the Epistle, that "the apostle, having adopted Babylon to designate Rome, might, for the same reason, have employed these other Asiatic names to represent regions which it would have been dangerous to mention by their real names."

The only thing in the Epistle which has been thought of as fitted to cast light on the question whether it was written in the Eastern Babylon or in Rome, is the order in which

the names of the provinces mentioned in the first verse stand. To this, with characteristic acuteness, attention was drawn by Bengel: Quinque provincias nominat eo ordine quo occurrebant scribenti ex oriente. Supposing the course which his messenger would take in travelling through Asia Minor for the purpose of encouraging the Churches, and of delivering copies of the Epistle, to have been in Peter's mind while he was writing, the order of the names certainly suggests that he was in a place not west of Asia Minor, but east,—some region from which a traveller would first reach the north-east district, Pontus, and then go on westward. The somewhat zigzag arrangement of the names exactly accords with the probable course of a messenger sent from the east to visit all the important Churches in the region. The argument, while not perhaps so strong as Bengel apparently thought it, seems to be by no means without force. Quite conceivably, no doubt, something altogether different from thought of the route which Silvanus would take in travelling with the letter might dictate the order in which the apostle has put the names; yet this explanation does appear the most natural,—for one certainly expects the address of a communication which is to be delivered successively to several individuals or communities to follow what is likely to be the order of delivery. Canon Cook (*Speaker's Commentary, Introduction to First Peter*, § 4) feels the force of the argument, and—holding that Rome was the place of writing—attempts to show that it tells in favour of his view. "The first district mentioned," he says, "is Pontus. Now Pontus was a district in constant communication with Rome; a vessel proceeding from Rome would probably proceed there directly, if its course was determined by the lines of traffic; and, whether we suppose that it was sent on public or on Christian business, the seaports of Pontus would be equally convenient. On the other hand, had the messenger of St. Peter started from Babylon, it is impossible that Pontus should have been the first district which he reached, or that which

would naturally present itself first to the apostle's mind." The last of these sentences appears to be simply an arbitrary contradiction of a general, natural, reasonable belief; for whilst, no doubt, Cappadocia was the nearest to Babylon of the provinces named, yet innumerable circumstances might have directed the messenger's route to Pontus first. The likelihood of the supposition set forth in the earlier part of the quotation must be left to be determined by individual judgement.

5. On the whole, Wetstein's conclusion seems sound: Cur Babylon in Italia potius aut Ægypto quam in Mesopotamia sit quærenda, causam non video. No really strong reason presents itself for departing from the *prima facie* sense of the name.

V.—STRUCTURE AND LITERARY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPISTLE.

1. The Epistle is an earnest and affectionate pastoral address to a number of congregations which, besides the common difficulties incident to all Christians, had also the special anxieties and spiritual dangers connected with present and growing persecution.

2. This special element in the position of those believers for whose benefit, in the first instance, the apostle wrote, has in great measure determined the tone of the letter. What is distinctive in it, as compared with the other N. T. writings, is mainly its peculiar wealth of teaching fitted to cheer persecuted Christians, and sustain them in faith and in holy resolution. It is particularly with respect to the bearings of the gospel on the various kinds of spiritual peril which this form of trial brings with it—temptation to impatience, to unbelief and distrust, to despondency, to sinful compromises with the world — that Peter "exhorts and testifies" that the way of life through Christ, of which the

Asiatic Churches had heard from Paul and other evangelists, was "the true grace of God" (v. 12). "The great and permanent merit of our Epistle is to have first distinctly set forth the right view as to the position of Christians in reference to the whole power of heathendom, and to its persecutions of the Church" (Ewald, cited by Cook).

3. The structure of the letter is in every respect simple and natural. Reminders of the richness and grandeur of the Christian's privileges and hopes, set forth to comfort and to stimulate, lead easily into direct inculcation of holiness of heart and life, and of the special obligations attaching to particular stations and relations. Throughout the whole letter, sympathy with the Asiatic believers in their trials shows itself distinctly, and strong desire so to guide their thoughts and affections that the persecution may be to all of them a helpful discipline; and in the latter part of the Epistle this subject is dealt with expressly and at large.

4. The outline of the letter is as follows. After the superscription and salutation (i. 1, 2) comes a singularly rich and beautiful description of the privileges of believers (i. 3–9), and of the glory of that gospel which is proclaimed to them, —a gospel looked forward to with eager longing by the holy prophets of old, and gazed down into with intensest loving interest by the angels (i. 10–12).

On this representation of privilege naturally bases itself an exhortation to duty; and this, *first*, general, to the cultivation of holiness (i. 13–ii. 10),—an obligation manifestly resting on the believers as being called by and children of God (i. 13–17), and redeemed with the blood of Christ (i. 18–21). Having received into their souls by faith God's word of life, the readers are to seek to know this word ever more deeply, and to grow in that spirit of love, without which there cannot be increasing assimilation of the word for spiritual nourishment (i. 22–ii. 3). Thus they will be built in as living stones in the temple which rests on the living foundation, Christ,—who is a stone of stumbling to His foes, but precious to them

that believe (ii. 4–8). This general section of the practical portion of the Epistle closes with another inspiriting sketch of the privileges of Christians, and this in Old Testament language which was originally employed to describe the blessed position of Israel as Jehovah's people, and thus, as used in the Epistle, represents the Church of Christ as the spiritual Israel (ii. 9, 10).

In the *second* section of the practical part we have a series of injunctions to the performance of special duties (ii. 11–v. 9), introduced by an appeal to all the Christians to remember that, as citizens of heaven who at the present are pilgrims in an alien world, they should show to all around them a winning heavenly beauty of life (ii. 11, 12). One important element in such beauty of life was *submission* to those under whose authority God's providence had placed them,—the submission of subjects to their rulers (ii. 13–17); of servants to their masters, and this with patient endurance even of cruel wrong, as Christ, the Sinless One, meekly bore the cruelties of those sinners whom He came to save (ii. 18–25); of wives to their husbands (iii. 1–6). By correlation, this last injunction suggests the duty of husbands to their wives (iii. 7). To all believers now, whatever their special positions and relations, the apostle addresses an appeal to cultivate mutual love (iii. 8), and under the hostility of the men of the world to return good for evil (iii. 9), — the appeal being enforced by a quotation from the Old Testament (iii. 10–12).

At this point counsels specially addressed to the believers as members of a *persecuted* Church begin; and the thought of trial seems to be vividly before the writer's mind to the close of the practical part of his letter (iii. 13–v. 9), though there are occasionally short passages in which it does not definitely show itself. Under persecution, believers, feeling that, because they are God's children, they cannot suffer permanent harm, should be restful, stedfast, and manly (iii. 13–15), having ever before their hearts as the matter

of main concern the prayerful resolution that their sufferings shall be in and for well-doing, and never in and for evil-doing (iii. 16, 17). The fact, signally illustrated in the case of the Redeemer Himself, that suffering for righteousness' sake in flesh brings quickening in spirit, is fitted to give to His people under persecution peculiar consolation and peculiar stimulus (iii. 18–iv. 6). The thought of His second coming also should be much before their minds (iv. 7*a*), leading to prayer and watchfulness (iv. 7*b*), and sustaining brotherly love (iv. 8), which should show itself in kind dealings towards each other, both in the way of aid in the matters of this world, hospitality being specified (iv. 9), and in spiritual helpfulness (iv. 10, 11).

A fiery trial was upon the apostle's readers, which ought not to astonish and depress them as if it were something wholly different from what, as Christians, they might have expected (iv. 12). On the contrary, they should rejoice as they thought of the connection between present fellowship with Christ in His sufferings and future fellowship with Him in His glory (iv. 13); nay, they should count the very suffering for Him to be itself true glory (iv. 14). But let them see to it that they suffered never for evil-doing, but always strictly as Christians (iv. 15, 16). Their sufferings were fitted to awaken in them a thankful remembrance of God's grace to them in Christ; for, if sin be so evil that even His own people need for discipline such painful trials here, how awful must that doom be which awaits His enemies hereafter, and from which His love saves believers (iv. 17, 18)! Therefore, thinking of all His goodness, let them trust Him fully, earnestly doing His will (iv. 19).

At this point the apostle proceeds to give special injunctions to the elders of the various congregations (v. 1–3), and encourages them in their work by reminding them of the glorious reward which awaits Christ's faithful servants (v. 4). By correlation, this naturally leads to a special word of exhortation to the younger members (v. 5*a*), followed by injunctions for all to be humble, trustful, and watchful

against the temptations of the devil (v. 5*b*–9). The hortatory part of the Epistle then closes with an affectionate prayer for the suffering brethren, ending with a doxology (v. 10, 11).

After this come a few concluding words. The apostle makes a kind reference to his messenger Silvanus, and states in a summary way what had been his purpose in writing the letter (v. 12); sends the Christian salutations of the Church at Babylon, and those of Marcus (v. 13); calls on his readers to "greet one another with a kiss of love" (v. 14*a*); and ends, as he began, with a benediction (v. 14*b*).

5. This outline of the contents of the letter shows sufficiently that the apostle does not write specially to teach theology, but, by practical advice and kind encouragement, to strengthen the religious life of persons assumed to be already well-informed Christians. His references to theology include nothing which is not, in substance, set forth also in other parts of the New Testament,—with the exception, according to one interpretation of chap. iii. 19, 20, iv. 6, of a statement regarding the Lord's work during the three days between His death and resurrection.

6. As compared with Paul, the apostle of faith, and John, the apostle of love, Peter is sometimes called the apostle of hope. There is ground for this name. The words ἐλπίς and ἐλπίζειν, indeed, do not occur in the letter unusually often (i. 3, 13, 21, iii. 5, 15); but—as was most natural, in any circumstances, in an old man, worn with labour and looking forward to the martyr's death, of which his Lord had long before told him, and specially natural when he was writing to Christians placed in the midst of sore trial—he constantly turns his own thoughts and theirs to the joys and glories of the future life (cf. i. 3–8, 13, iii. 7, iv. 13, v. 1, 4, 6, 10). "Everything is seen in the light of the end. The 'appearing' of Jesus Christ fills the view" (Salmond). Yet at the same time this loving, eager anticipation associates itself in the Epistle, in a very interesting way, with an unusual abundance

of reference to the Old Economy. A peculiarly cherished aspect, evidently, in the apostle's mind, of the Church of Christ—one which is presented to us in the first words of the superscription, and constantly, in many ways, throughout—is that of the spiritual Israel of God. The retrospective and prospective tendencies harmonize beautifully; and it is hardly too much to say with Bonifas (*L'Unité de l'enseignement apostolique*, p. 55, cited by Lechler) that all the teaching of the Epistle is grouped round this central idea, L'Evangile —accomplissement des promesses,—et promesse à son tour. For a systematic exhibition of the doctrinal teaching found in the Epistle, Schmid's or Weiss's *Biblical Theology of N. T.* may be consulted, or Lechler's *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times;* and as to the Christology in particular, Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 294–299.

7. While thus our Epistle has very little in its teaching which can strictly be called distinctive, it has at the same time a well-marked character of its own. Those of the Pauline Epistles to which the aim and structure of Peter's give it most resemblance are Philippians and First Thessalonians. But from these, as from all Paul's writings, it is distinguished by its having announcements and exhortations merely, with little or nothing of formal reasoning; and also through the rarity in it of any reference to the writer's own history and feelings, such as constitutes one most striking feature of Paul's letters. Such reference is not altogether wanting here (v. 1); and, of course, in an Epistle like the present, addressed to Christians whom in all probability the apostle had not visited, there was in any case less likelihood of much personal allusion than in Paul's Epistles to the Churches of Philippi and Thessalonica, which he had himself founded. But, comparing Peter's letter with those to the Romans and the Colossians, Churches which at the time of writing Paul knew only by report, we see Peter to be much nearer the impersonal in style than evidently was possible for the temperament of his brother apostle.

8. From the style of the Epistle of James, again, that of

Peter's is very clearly marked off; in that, though Peter employs Old Testament phraseology considerably more than James does, his whole tone and current of thought are much more distinctively New Testament than James's, whose writing is like that of a Joel or Amos of Christian times.

9. With the evidence regarding one feature of the Apostle Peter's character which is afforded by the wealth of Christian consolation found in the Epistle, its literary structure also accords in a somewhat singular measure. From this literary structure itself one might gather him to have been a man of eminently sympathetic and receptive mind, one exceedingly open to impression from men or from books—a characteristic which, whilst at times betraying his impulsive nature into what was weak or wrong, as on the occasion when he incurred Paul's rebuke at Antioch, must have been one great element in his manifest power to win affection. The union of sympathy with the noble strength that lay at the basis of his character was the secret of his vast influence for good. The flower wreathed and beautified the "rock."

This receptiveness of nature is illustrated in the frequency, referred to a moment ago, with which Old Testament language is employed by the apostle, not merely in the way of definite quotation, but as the vesture in which his own thoughts are clothed.

It shows itself still more strikingly in his use of the writings of his fellow-apostle Paul. That echoes of these are to be recognised in our Epistle, hardly admits of reasonable doubt. It is true that on a considerable number of those coincidences of thought or of expression which are to be found no conclusion to this effect could safely be rested, because the coincidence may be sufficiently explained as due simply to the employment by both apostles of what had become commonplaces of the religious thought and language of their age. But some of the similarities, from their nature and from the connections in which they present themselves, cannot well be accounted for in this way. Such are the

following,—1 Pet. ii. 13, 14, compared with Rom. xiii. 1, 3, 4; 1 Pet. ii. 24, with Rom. vi. 8–14; 1 Pet. iii. 8, 9, with Rom. xii. 10, 13–17; 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2, with Rom. vi. 6, 7; 1 Pet. ii. 16, with Gal. v. 13. These are perhaps the strongest cases, and they seem to afford satisfactory proof of Peter's familiarity with Romans, and a strong probability also of his knowing Galatians. Similarities, more or less striking, of thought or expression, or both, between our Epistle and several others of Paul's have been noticed. As regards Ephesians, in particular, some scholars—Holtzmann, Renan, Salmon, and others—have deemed the evidence of use by Peter to be satisfactory; and there certainly is a probability, but the cases of likeness adduced do not appear to be so decisive as with respect to Romans.[1]

[1] The following similarities, in addition to those mentioned in the text, have been pointed out by one writer or another :—

1 Pet.	i. 1, 2,	with Eph. i. 4–7.
„	i. 2,	„ 2 Thess. ii. 13.
„	i. 3,	„ Eph. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3.
„	i. 5,	„ Gal. iii. 23; Eph. i. 19.
„	i. 14,	„ Eph. ii. 3; Rom. xii. 2.
„	i. 18,	„ Eph. iv. 17.
„	i. 20,	„ Rom. iv. 24, xvi. 25; Col. i. 26.
„	i. 21,	„ Rom. iv. 24.
„	i. 22,	„ Rom. xii. 9.
„	ii. 1,	„ Col. iii. 8.
„	ii. 5,	„ Rom. xii. 1; Eph. ii. 20–22.
„	ii. 6–10,	„ Rom. ix. 25, 32 foll.
„	ii. 11,	„ Rom. vii. 23.
„	ii. 17,	„ Rom. xii. 10.
„	ii. 18,	„ Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22.
„	ii. 21,	„ Rom. vi. 18.
„	iii. 1,	„ Eph. v. 22; Col. iii. 18.
„	iii. 3, 4,	„ 1 Tim. ii. 9.
„	iii. 18,	„ Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12.
„	iii. 22,	„ Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20–22.
„	iv. 9,	„ Phil. ii. 14.
„	iv. 10 foll.	„ Rom. xii. 6 foll.
„	iv. 13,	„ Rom. viii. 17.
„	v. 1,	„ Rom. viii. 18.
„	v. 5,	„ Eph. v. 21.
„	v. 8,	„ 1 Thess. v. 6.
„	v. 9,	„ Eph. vi. 10.
„	v. 10, 11,	„ Phil. iv. 19.
„	v. 14,	„ 1 Cor. xvi. 20; Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Thess. v. 26.

In a good many of these cases the resemblance is exceedingly slight.

10. The question occurs whether, in thus again and again making use of passages in Paul's Epistles, when writing to Churches which Paul had founded, and by many members of which in all likelihood some of these Epistles were well known, the Apostle Peter might not perhaps have a definite intention to suggest, in a quiet and unobtrusive but very convincing way, how complete was his confidence in Paul, and how warm his affection for him. This is obviously possible, and seems to be not improbable. There is evidence, both in statements of the New Testament and in early post-apostolic Christian literature, that, whilst complete cordiality and mutual confidence existed among the apostles themselves, yet in various places members of the Church misapprehended entirely the relations of Peter and Paul to each other. An arrangement for division of labour adopted simply on grounds of expediency, and those slight diversities in modes of procedure incident to the diversity in their fields of action, were taken as evincing an important difference of religious opinion between the apostles of the circumcision on the one side, and Paul and his associates on the other. We have no information, nor any data from which we could reasonably infer, that among the Churches of Asia Minor there was anything like the definite sectarianism of Corinth, which had for battle-cries "I am of Paul," "and I of Cephas." Still, remembering how active and influential, a few years before the probable date of our Epistle, Judaizers of different types had been in Galatia and at Colossæ,—all of which class of teachers probably professed to regard the apostles of the circumcision as their special religious leaders,—it seems far from unlikely that some misconceptions with respect to the relations between Peter and Paul may have been entertained in some of the Churches. The supposition that there did exist erroneous beliefs of this kind, of which Peter had heard, is certainly not at all needful to account for his use of Paul's writings in his letter, nor indeed is it perhaps strictly necessary for the explanation of anything that occurs in the

letter; but it does place his making use of Paul's Epistles in a peculiarly beautiful light, and it gives, too, a special importance and force to such a statement as that so emphatically made in i. 12, that Paul and the other founders of the Churches in those parts had "preached the gospel to them with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," and that other in v. 12, where Peter mentions it as one of his objects in writing the Epistle, "to testify that this"—the system of beliefs and hopes which he had illustrated in his letter, and which all his readers must have felt to be at every point essentially the same as that which Paul had taught them—"was the true grace of God," and urges them to "stand in this grace." Language like this reasonably suggests that the writer knew some among his readers to have been disposed to set a Petrine doctrine of "the grace of God" over against the Pauline, and that therefore Peter judged it needful to declare, in the most explicit way, that Paul's gospel and his gospel were one—which had been taught to Paul, as to him, "by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." Such suggestion comes forward in the latter of the passages just quoted more definitely and vividly if we read ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκατε than if we follow the better-supported reading στῆτε; but with the imperative also it seems naturally to present itself in some measure.

11. There appears to be considerable reason to believe that echoes of the Epistle of James also, as well as of the Pauline writings, are to be recognised in Peter's letter. When we remember the impressibleness and receptiveness of Peter's mind, this is antecedently probable. James and he had long been closely associated in labour, and in all likelihood were intimate friends; and there can be little doubt that James's Epistle had been published many years before the time when Peter wrote his. Two of the similarities of the one letter to the other are hardly, in themselves, proofs of reminiscence, namely, the quotations from O. T. which are made in Jas. i. 10, 11, v. 20, and also in 1 Pet. i. 24,

iv. 8; for the passages cited are such as may reasonably be assumed to have been familiar to every pious Jew. In both instances, moreover, the quotations are more full in Peter than in James, and are applied somewhat differently. But a comparison of Jas. i. 2, 3, with 1 Pet. i. 6, 7, and of Jas. iv. 6–10, with 1 Pet. v. 5–9, certainly establishes a strong likelihood that in these places the one writer influenced the other.

12. Whilst, however, the Epistle thus gives evidence of the receptiveness of the apostle's mind, individuality also, as has already been said, shows itself clearly in the mode in which the various subjects are dealt with. Looking at them from a point of his own, his treatment has always freshness and interest. As regards the sufferings of Christ, for instance, whilst clearly bringing out their atoning character (i. 18, 19, ii. 24, iii. 18), he dwells also with peculiar fulness on the aspect of example which they present to believers amid the oppositions of the world, both in that they were wholly undeserved, and in that they were borne with perfect patience and sweetness of spirit (ii. 21–23, iii. 17, 18, iv. 1, 13). The mediatorial position of the Lord, too,—the fact that all holiness and all happiness for men are "through" Him,—comes before us in the letter with striking frequency, and occasionally in somewhat unusual aspects. The hope of His people has life "through His resurrection" (i. 3). Faith in God comes to men "through Him" (i. 21). The spiritual sacrifices of the saints are acceptable to God "through Him" (ii. 5). Salvation is "through His resurrection" (iii. 21). In the wise use of spiritual gifts by Christians God is glorified "through Him" (iv. 11). Closely analogous also is that pointed enunciation of the truth that before the incarnation, as well as since, divine revelation to man has been "through Christ," which is given by the name "the Spirit of Christ" (i. 11), applied to the Divine Teacher of the prophets, and also—according to what seems to be the probable meaning of the passage—by the statement (iii. 19, 20) that the pre-

incarnate Logos "preached" to the antediluvians. But the chief specialty of the apostle's cast of thought, as represented in this letter, is that to which attention has previously been directed, the singularly interesting union of retrospect and prospect, his living so much in musings on O. T. words and scenes, and at the same time so much in anticipation of the "glorious appearing" of the Lord, and the blessedness of the New Jerusalem.

The apostle has some striking individualities of phrase. Such, for instance, are the "living hope" (i. 3), and "for consciousness of God" (ii. 19).

Lexically, also, our Epistle has a good deal which is peculiar, there being sixty words which occur only here in N. T.,[1]— including several found elsewhere only very rarely, or not at all, such as ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ἀρχιποίμην, συνεκλεκτός. These last words, or one or other of them, may possibly be creations of the apostle himself, a natural enough outcome of his eager, impetuous temperament.

13. As regards syntax, the apostle's style of expression has little which is peculiar. His sentences are generally simple and lucid. They are often short; and expansion, where it does occur, is of an easy and natural kind, — one rather favourite form with him, especially in hortatory passages, being the keeping of a considerable series of thoughts in connection with one main verb, by using participles (see, for instance, ii. 13 foll.). Paul also somewhat loves this structure (see, for example, Rom. xii. 9 foll.). Peter is fond, too, of introducing what are substantially new sentences by the relative pronoun (cf. i. 6, 8, 10, 12, ii. 4),—a mode of expression which crept into the later Greek probably through the influence of Latin. It is not infrequent also in other parts of N. T., but is somewhat specially common in Peter.

[1] A list of these words is given in the Appendix to Thayer's edition of Grimm's *N. T. Lexicon.*

COMMENTARY.

—o—

CHAPTER I.

Vv. 1, 2. *Superscription and Salutation.*

Ver. 1. The new name given to the apostle by his Master appears to have been, as was natural, that which he commonly employed, and by which he was generally known in the Church,—usually in the Greek form, as here, not unfrequently also in the Aramaic, "Cephas" (Paul using the two indifferently). The name "Simon" or "Symeon," however, familiar to his early friends, was not discarded either by them or by him (cf. Acts xv. 14; 2 Pet. i. 1). His appending to his name his official appellation, *ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, natural and usual in any case in a letter of this kind, has obviously a special pertinence in the present instance, from the fact that Peter was writing to Churches which he had not himself planted, nor even perhaps ever visited. The title "apostle" is a reminder at the outset that the writer was one of that little group of servants of Christ to whom had been given by the Master the oversight, not of particular congregations, but of the whole Church.

By some good interpreters (as Leighton and Brown) it has been held that *ἐκλεκτοῖς* here does not point to God's eternal choice, but to the result of that choice, the selection and separation in time—the "calling," in fact—of the persons spoken of. In support of this sense reference is made to the use of *ἐκλέγεσθαι* in John xv. 19; 1 Cor. i. 26–28. To this view of the meaning in the present passage these scholars are led by consideration of the adjunct in ver. 2, *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ*

Πνεύματος. Obviously, when these words come in, the actual separation from the sinful world is in the apostle's mind, the preposition *ἐν*, in the connection, clearly indicating a *means*, whilst of the divine eternal choice this *ἁγιασμός* is undoubtedly a *result*. But it is not needful on this account to suppose that our apostle uses *ἐκλεκτοῖς* with a different reference from that which the word usually has. Starting with the thought of the all-efficient divine choice, the mind of a reader follows down the line of the operation of this choice towards the actual severance which it brings about; and thus an allusion to means has in it nothing unnatural. On the other hand, when looked at in connection with the *first* of the adjuncts, *κατὰ πρόγνωσιν κτλ.*, any other reference of *ἐκλεκτοῖς* than to the eternal choice does seem unnatural and improbable; for one instinctively thinks of the passage thus far as being precisely parallel to Paul's *οὓς προέγνω καὶ προώρισε* (Rom. viii. 29).

As to the meaning of *παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς*, and as to the history of the Churches in the various districts named, see the Introduction, § II. The words *ἐπίδημος* and *ἐπιδημεῖν* are found employed by writers of the best age in the sense of making a temporary home among strangers (*e.g.* Plato, *Apol. Soc.* § 4), as well as with their primitive force of living among one's own people; and among the later writers the secondary use became the prevalent one (cf. Acts ii. 10, xvii. 21). In the compound *παρεπίδημος* prominence is given to this thought of *temporary* residence by the preposition,—living "beside" the dwellers, not strictly "among" them. On the pilgrim state of believers compare, besides references given in the Introduction, Phil. iii. 20, Heb. xiii. 14, also a fine chapter of Hermas, *Sim.* i., and the well-known and exquisite passage in the Epistle to Diognetus, chap. v.

Ver. 2. The grammatical connection of the three expressions which form the first part of this verse is not altogether clear. By a number of the older interpreters, as Oecumenius and Theophylact (with whom a few of the modern agree, as Kahnis and—alternatively, but seemingly with preference—

Canon Cook), these adjuncts are attached to ἀπόστολος. A statement similar to that which we should thus have here respecting divine appointment to the apostleship, and respecting the aim of that office, is found in the superscription of several of the Pauline Epistles, the one in Romans, in particular, corresponding pretty closely to that supposed to be given here. But Peter's arrangement of words is utterly against this view of the connection. In every case Paul ends all that he means to say in the way of expanding the designation "apostle," before he proceeds to name those to whom he writes. Cook's position, that Peter's mention of the persons addressed—which is quite evidently one of the two main parts of the sentence—may be regarded as parenthetical, is wholly unnatural and untenable. Huther takes the connection of these adjuncts to be with ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις; but, having regard to the meaning of the clauses, it seems to be decidedly most natural, with the majority of interpreters, to attach them immediately and simply to ἐκλεκτοῖς. In beginning a letter of specifically *Christian* instruction and counsel, the apostle of necessity had the distinctive position, privileges, and character of Christians vividly present to his mind; and the thought regarding these which rose up before him most prominently was that of the glorious grace of God to which they were due. Thus he naturally gave ἐκλεκτοῖς the emphatic position which it has,—thus he naturally carried the thought of ἐκλεκτοῖς with him over the enumeration of the provinces, and to *it* attached the words which follow,—thus naturally also, immediately after the superscription and salutation, he opens the letter itself with a glowing doxology, acknowledging God's "abundant mercy."—The three adjuncts set forth respectively the *origin* of election, the *means* by which it acts, and its *aim*. In this series we observe a distinct reference to the Trinity, these expressions exhibiting the loving interest and participation of the Three Persons of the Godhead in the work of redemption,—here particularly in the *application* of

redemption. The choice of God's peculiar people has its origin in the will of the Father, works out its purpose through the renewing and consecrating influence of the Spirit, and has for its aim full enjoyment by them of the salvation purchased through the shed blood of Jesus Christ.

The first of this series of epexegetical statements, as has been said, exhibits the *origin* of the ἐκλογή. In the connection there can be no reasonable doubt that this is what is indicated by κατά. The primary sense of this preposition (cf. Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, § 182) seems to be "in line with" (see, for example, Acts xxvii. 7). From this all its varied applications naturally spring. In that most common use exemplified in the present passage, where the preposition is an expression of parallelism or correspondence in the most general way, answering to our English "according to," the precise nature of the relation intended depends on the nature of the objects which are exhibited in connection with each other. Now, seeing that in our passage the three adjuncts evidently set before us a *course*, which is carried forward ἐν, and leads εἰς, κατά is naturally taken to indicate the originating influence; and, comparing Scripture teaching elsewhere with respect to the relation between election and the divine foreknowledge (Rom. viii. 29), we cannot hesitate in the judgement that the force of κατά is "by virtue of, in pursuance of." The connection is one of cause and effect.

By πρόγνωσις, as the word is here employed, more appears to be meant than simple prescience. As has been already seen, it is clearly represented as being an active power, the influence which originates a course of procedure. This being borne in mind, then, there appear to be, if we take simple prescience to be meant, two possible complements. (1) The meaning might be, "by virtue of God's foreknowledge of what in all circumstances would best promote the grand ultimate aim of all His working, His own glory." This would be true and relevant. But the connection in which πρόγνωσις here stands seems to forbid our filling out the thought with anything so general as

this, and to require something referring specifically to the ἐκλεκτοί themselves. This objection is sustained, too, by the fact that in both the places where the verb προγινώσκειν occurs in N. T. in any connection similar to the present (Rom. viii. 29, xi. 2), its object is *personal*. (2) Supposing, then, a special reference to the elect, we might take the meaning to be "by virtue of God's foreknowledge of excellence or attractiveness, faith or holiness, in certain persons." But the position that election is κατὰ πρόγνωσιν, with such a force of πρόγνωσις as this, is directly opposed to the teaching of Scripture (*e.g.* 2 Tim. i. 9; Rom. ix. 11), cause and effect, indeed, being by such a representation made to change places (Eph. i. 3, 4),—and self-contradiction is thus introduced into the present passage, even taken simply by itself, for it describes those of whom it speaks as being ἐκλεκτοὶ εἰς ὑπακοήν. With neither of what appear to be the only possible complements, therefore, is the sense of mere prescience tenable. Besides the objections which have been mentioned, another presents itself in the structure of the sentence, there being, as has been seen, in the series of adjuncts a clear reference to the Three Divine Persons. This structure seems plainly to require in the first member of the series what is obvious in the other two, not mention of a general attribute of the Godhead, but of something which Scripture has taught us to recognise as special in the relation borne to the work of redemption by the Divine Person named. Now, with regard to God the Father, the eternal *purpose* is what is constantly made prominent; cf. *e.g.* Eph. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 9; Jas. i. 18. Thus we are naturally led to think of the idea of purpose, predetermination, as involved with prescience, in the sense of πρόγνωσις as the word is used in our passage. It is true that this cannot be shown to have been a classical use of either the substantive or its cognate verb, a fact which, according to his wont, is decisive with Meyer in his lengthened and able discussion of the question (on Rom. viii. 29). But with the fact before us that a quite familiar classical use

of the simple verb γιγνώσκειν is in the sense of "resolve, decide" (as Herod. i. 74, 78), there seems to be nothing arbitrary, or other than entirely natural, in our giving the corresponding force to the compound with πρό in N. T., if the course of thought in the places where the word occurs appears plainly to call for some such sense. It may, like many other words, receive a heightening of its significance when baptized into Christianity; just as, for example, an element of approbation and affection enters sometimes into the sense of the simple verb γιγνώσκειν in N. T. use (as Matt. vii. 23; 1 Cor. viii. 3), in accordance with a common use of the Hebrew יָדַע (as Amos iii. 2). That the course of thought in those passages in N. T., where προγινώσκειν and πρόγνωσις are said of God, does demand something additional to the simple sense of prescience, has been felt by a very large proportion even of those expositors who doubt whether "predetermination" is meant; many (as Tholuck, Hofmann, Delitzsch, T. S. Green) adopting in some form that notion of affectionate regard which has just been mentioned as found sometimes in the simple verb. But this does not suit all the passages; see Acts ii. 23, and ver. 20 of the present chapter. The sense of *purpose* fits all the places; and it cannot but be felt that, as applied to God, this meaning attaches itself to πρόγνωσις altogether naturally, for the prescience of "Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will" is simply His consciousness of His own purpose in all its ramifications. Supposing an element of purpose to be included in the force of the word, still plainly in our passage "election," as in Rom. viii. 29 "predestination," is distinguished from it. What the distinction is, we have not data for judging, further than that evidently the divine πρόγνωσις is represented as the basis on which the divine ἐκλογή or προορισμός rises, or the source from which it springs. The fact that with regard to the counsels of the Infinite One we cannot determine with precision the respective reference of the words, is plainly not in itself any reason for concluding

that the element of purpose does not enter at all into the sense of *πρόγνωσις*; but it is a good reason why, not assuming to know more than we do know, we should content ourselves in translation with the simple rendering of the word which the Spirit has chosen to employ, "foreknowledge." On the force of *πρόγνωσις*, cf. Fritzsche on Rom. viii. 29.

The second of the adjuncts to *ἐκλεκτοῖς*, *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος*, sets forth the *means* by which the divine choice reaches its aim, "in (through) consecration of (by) the Spirit." The force of the root *ἁγ-*, in *ἅγιος*, *ἅγος*, *ἄζομαι* κτλ., Sanscr. *jaǵ*, is "religious reverence or awe;" cf. Curtius, *Gr. Etym.* (E. T.) i. p. 199. Into *ἅγιος* and its derivatives biblical usage poured a rich ethical significance, no word perhaps showing more the transfiguring power of divine revelation. The sense of "to be revered simply as set apart for the service of God," presents itself when *ἅγιος* is used of the temple, the shewbread, the oil for anointing the priests, and the like. Similarly, when the sinless Lord Jesus applies the word *ἁγιάζειν* to Himself (John x. 36, xvii. 19), the simple sense of the verb is "consecrate, set apart for priestly service." But where sinful beings are said *ἁγιάζεσθαι*, reference to character becomes prominent, the spiritual unction to service imparting that holiness without which there can be no true service. On the N. T. meaning of *ἅγιος* and its cognates, cf. particularly the excellent discussion of Cremer. The substantive *ἁγιασμός*—which, like the verb, is unknown to classical Greek—denotes strictly, according to its termination, an act in process, and this primarily (cf. Donaldson, *Gr. Gram.* §§ 357, 361) in immediate relation to the actor, that is to say, answering to the active voice of the verb, — transition, however, to the passive aspect, or ultimately to the state resulting, being easy and frequent. In the case before us the course of thought appears to lead most naturally to the passive aspect, *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ* being thus equivalent to *ἐν τῷ* (or *διὰ τοῦ*) *ἁγιάζεσθαι*. In most of the passages in N. T. where *ἁγιασμός* occurs, it seems to be used (cf. Meyer on Rom. vi. 19) not, according to the

primary force of this class of nouns, of the *formation* of holy character, but, according to that tertiary force mentioned above to which they often tend, of the character itself, "holiness." In 2 Thess. ii. 13, however, where the whole combination found here occurs, and still more decidedly in the place before us, the idea of *process* seems to be distinctly required. The course of thought suggests, too, that "consecration" is the exact word, rather than "sanctification." "Sanctification," with its specific ethical reference, would seem, with "unto obedience" following immediately, to involve something of tautology, which is avoided by the more general "consecration" — separation to sacred function and privilege. If, moreover, we take "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" to mean "justification," as is natural, then obviously the wide word "consecration" is the suitable one in describing the means. This designates the gracious work of the Spirit of God on the souls of God's chosen, in its full length and breadth,—pointing in the first instance to conversion, but including also that continued stimulating and supporting influence, that continued "unction," which maintains the consecration in constant freshness. — *Πνεύματος* might be regarded as an objective genitive, the "spirit" being that of man; but N. T. usage with regard to this word in connections at all like the present favours the sense of "the Divine Spirit;" and the clear reference in the series of adjuncts to the Trinity is quite decisive.—As mentioned above, the combination *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος* occurs also in 2 Thess. ii. 13. The striking character of the expression, and the kindred nature of the sentences in which it occurs in the two Epistles, make it not improbable that this is one of our apostle's occasional reminiscences of Paul's writings.

3 The last of the three adjuncts sets forth the *aim* of election. Summarily stated, this aim is eternal life. Of this the apostle exhibits the two main elements separately. A question of construction presents itself here. It is possible to regard the genitive *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* as governed by *ὑπακοήν*

as well as by *αἵματος*, and the combination *ὑπακοὴν Χριστοῦ* occurs in 2 Cor. x. 5. Some, as Steiger, favour this construction, being mainly influenced by the structure of the other two adjuncts, in each of which there is compactness, "the Father's foreknowledge," "the Spirit's consecrating grace." This does raise a certain likelihood that here also the apostle is looking at all he says as in immediate relation to Christ. But the double construction is somewhat awkward and unnatural, the genitive being objective in relation to the one governing substantive, and possessive in relation to the other. Coming in, moreover, as the expression *εἰς ὑπακοήν* does, to express the aim, as regards character, of "election according to the foreknowledge of God the Father," who in the scheme of redemption represents the majesty of the Godhead, it seems probable that the exact form of the apostle's thought was "unto obedience to *God;*" which is readily suggested by the expression taken *absolutely*, "unto obedience."

The initial act of evangelical obedience is faith in Christ (John vi. 29 ; 1 John iii. 23), and the fundamental element in all evangelical obedience is continued faith. In various combinations *ὑπακούειν* and *ὑπακοή* are employed in N. T. to set forth this aspect of faith ; cf. Acts vi. 7 ; Rom. vi. 17, x. 16, xvi. 26. In *ὑπακοή*, therefore, as here used plainly with its broadest reference, faith is included ; and the apostle's mode of speaking elsewhere in the Epistle leads naturally to the thought that probably, in employing the word here absolutely, this particular form or element of obedience had special prominence in his mind ; cf. i. 22, and, as regards the negative aspect, ii. 8, iii. 1, iv. 17. Again, faith is shown by the references made to it in vv. 5, 7, 9, to have been vividly present to the apostle's thoughts throughout the whole of the opening passage. Thus, when a reader, seeing how in our clause "obedience" is linked to "the sprinkling of the blood of Christ," and stands first in the combination, instinctively puts faith in the foreground in his conception of the intended meaning of "obedience," he seems to be fully supported by

all the data. To take ὑπακοή here, however, as *precisely* equivalent to the expression ὑπακοὴ τῆς ἀληθείας (ver. 22),—that is to say, as meaning "faith" simply,—would certainly be unnatural and contrary to analogy. The word means "obedience" in the widest sense, submission of heart and life to God (cf. ver. 14; Rom. vi. 16), but with faith, as the fundamental element of obedience, intended to stand out with special vividness.

Like ἁγιασμός (on which see note above), ῥαντισμός belongs only to biblical Greek. Here also, as with ἐν ἁγιασμῷ, the sense is naturally taken to be passive, "unto sprinkling" being = "to be sprinkled." When under the Old Economy sacrificial blood was sprinkled, this represented the application of its power; see Ex. xii. 2, xxiv. 8. In N. T. this mode of expression is employed with regard to the great Antitype; see Heb. x. 22, and particularly xii. 24, where the Saviour's blood is spoken of under the striking name of αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ,—that is, plainly, "blood, the grand purpose of the shedding of which was that it might be sprinkled on sinners." Thus in our passage εἰς ῥαντισμὸν κτλ. means "unto experience of the saving application of the power of Christ's sacrifice." What then is pointed to by this expression,—the justifying power of the atonement, or its sanctifying power, or both? By some expositors (as Steiger) the second of these references is maintained, the meaning of the whole clause being taken to be "unto obedience and experience"—that is, practically, "and this through experience"—"of the spiritually purifying efficacy of Christ's blood," its power to open the way for the bestowal of the influence of the Holy Ghost, and to stir men to holy action by the exhibition of the strongest motives to love and obedience. The structure of the clause would thus be closely analogous to that expression in John iii. 5, "born of water and of the Spirit," taken in what is probably the true meaning, "born of moral renewal, and this through the Spirit." The chief or only ground suggested for adopting this view of the meaning of Peter's words is that to

say "unto obedience and justification" seems to be to put the words in the inverse order from that which N. T. teaching would lead us to expect, seeing that a justified man alone can give evangelical obedience. But this difficulty is obviated, at all events to a great extent, when it is seen, through a consideration of various data, that in all likelihood the thought of *faith* was with special vividness before the mind of the apostle in the meaning which he attached to ὑπακοή. Supposing this objection out of the way, there cannot well be any hesitation in admitting that the probable reference of ῥαντισμὸν κτλ. is to justification. That in a passage setting forth the gracious purpose of God with respect to His chosen people there should not be any mention of the standing which they have before Him as accepted in His Son, is certainly unlikely; and that in such a passage there should not be any reference to this even where the blood of Christ is expressly mentioned, is unlikely in the very highest degree. What was primarily denoted in the sprinkling of blood under the Old Economy was, there can be no reasonable doubt, the removal of *guilt*—liability to punishment. The case of the Passover in Egypt, when the sprinkled blood secured for Israel safety from the stroke of the destroying angel, shows this with special clearness. It cannot well be questioned, therefore, that by his words here our apostle pointed to *justification*. Had ὑπακοήν been absent from the clause, or had there been reason to take ὑπακοήν as precisely equivalent to πίστιν, there might have been some ground for regarding ῥαντισμὸν κτλ. as referring *both* to justification and sanctification,—as, for example, a reader readily holds both to be pointed to by the language found in 1 John i. 7 and Rev. vii. 14. But this is not natural here.

Of the ordinary apostolic formula of salutation, "grace to you and peace," the basis, no doubt, is the customary word of greeting among the Semitic races, "Peace" (Matt. x. 12, 13). The comprehensive application of the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם—which a large induction of cases shows to stretch out, in its reference, from tranquillity to comfort and prosperity generally, "welfare"

in the widest sense—may safely be recognised also in the N. T. εἰρήνη. At the same time, the original element is always the main one, "peace, restfulness of heart." By including χάρις in their formula, the apostles lead up the thoughts of their readers to the great Fountain of true peace. The sequence was similar in the later members of the Jewish priestly benediction, "The Lord . . . be gracious unto thee, the Lord . . . give thee peace" (Num. vi. 25, 26); and it is not impossible that this may have influenced the form of the apostolic salutation. Some scholars regard the N. T. formula as having sprung from a combination of the Hebrew with the usual Greek epistolary greeting, χαίρειν (Acts xv. 23, xxiii. 26; Jas. i. 1),—the combination symbolizing perhaps the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ, and thus indirectly making an appeal for unity of spirit between the Jews and Gentiles who were members of those Christian congregations to which the apostles wrote. This suggestion is ingenious and interesting, but its soundness seems questionable. It accords with the data only in a superficial way, for though χάρις and χαίρειν are no doubt cognate, yet the meaning of the one is considerably removed from that of the other. Had such been the origin of the formula, χαρά seems to be the substantive which would naturally have been employed.—While Paul, in his letters, following the Hebrew form, omits a verb in his salutation, Peter both here and in the Second Epistle, and Jude also, have πληθυνθείη. This is found in O. T. in the salutation of two royal proclamations (Dan. iv. 1 [iii. 31, LXX.], vi. 25), and occurs occasionally also in the Rabbinical writings (see Wetstein, *in loc.*). Of course there is no substantial difference of meaning between πληθυνθείη and the understood εἴη of the Pauline form: only Peter's form implies, or at least suggests, what the other taken simply by itself does not, that those to whom he writes already in some measure enjoy "grace and peace." In this form of expression, as in so much else, Polycarp in his Epistle follows Peter,—Clement of Rome also. On the anarthrousness which is

common in the superscriptions of Greek letters, as in addresses of letters and headings of documents of all kinds among ourselves, and which is very marked in these first two verses, cf. Winer, p. 140, n. 6.

Vv. 3–9. *Ascription of praise to God for His grace in Christ, which not only secures to His people a glorious inheritance in heaven, but gives them here unspeakable joy, even though for a time they may have sore trials.*

Ver. 3. On the apostle's course of thought (seen in the superscription), which naturally leads him to begin his letter proper with a doxology, cf. above, near beginning of notes on ver. 2.—*Εὐλογητός* is in N. T. said of God only, the participle *εὐλογημένος* being employed where men are spoken of as "blessed." In the LXX. also this distinction is generally observed. Its ground is no doubt this, that whilst the participle simply states the fact, "blessed," the adjective either directly asserts, or even if used participially suggests by its form, worthiness of blessing. By Philo attention is drawn to this distinction: *εὐλογητὸς, οὐ μόνον εὐλογημένος· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τῷ πεφυκέναι εὐλογίας ἄξιον, τὸ δὲ τῷ νομίζεσθαι λέγεται μόνον* (*Migr. Abrah.*, Mang. p. 453). — It is not quite clear whether the verb to be supplied in this and similar doxologies is *εἴη* ("praised be") or *ἐστί* ("worthy to be praised is"); cf. A. Buttmann, p. 137. In iv. 11 and in Rom. i. 25 an indicative is expressed, and in 2 Cor. xi. 31 there is a participle answering to an indicative. In these cases, however, the clause is a secondary one, and therefore the construction appears hardly to present a perfect analogy to that in the place before us, where we have the main clause of the sentence, and in it the predicate *εὐλογητός* stands at the beginning with an emphasis which may naturally be judged to suggest that the sentence is expressive of a direct longing of the Christian heart, thus requiring the supplement *εἴη*,

rather than simply a doctrinal statement *ἐστί*; cf. Job i. 21 (Heb. and LXX.).

The designation of God as *ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* occurs several times in N. T.: Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3,—a little differently, 2 Cor. xi. 31; cf. also Rev. i. 6. *Πατήρ*, as applied to God, being often employed anarthrously in N. T., the construction may be "God and the Father—*i.e.* He who is God, and is the Father—of our Lord Jesus Christ;" but seeing that the name, "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ," is perfectly consistent with Scripture usage (Eph. i. 17; John xx. 17; Matt. xxvii. 46), there seems to be no good reason for departing from what is the most natural and obvious construction, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."—The whole of this clause, from *εὐλογητός* to *Χριστοῦ*, occurs also in Ephesians and in 2 Corinthians, occupying in both Epistles precisely the same position as here, namely, at the beginning of the paragraph which immediately follows the superscription. As used by Peter, the words may be a reminiscence from one of these Epistles; but the clause is in itself so natural a one to introduce our apostle's train of thought, and the words are so simple and natural a vesture for the idea, that the proof of reference to Paul cannot be deemed strong.

The ground of the *εὐλογία*, which has been already implied in the name, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," is expressly set forth in the long participial clause which follows, going on to the close of the 5th verse.—The verb *ἀναγεννάω* occurs in N. T. only here and in ver. 23 of this chapter, but the thought conveyed by it is found in the apostolic writings everywhere, under various forms of expression, — Paul's *παλιγγενεσία* (Tit. iii. 5), John's *τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι* and *ἐκ Θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι* (John i. 12, 13), James's *ἀποκυεῖσθαι λόγῳ ἀληθείας* (Jas. i. 18), whilst Peter's word here is only a slightly altered form of our Lord's own *γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν* (John iii. 3).—The thought of the goodness of God in redemption being the starting-point of the sentence,

the apostle, in speaking of regeneration, naturally introduces a reference to its origin in the divine grace, *κατὰ* (here practically causal, as in ver. 2) *τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος*; cf. Eph. ii. 4, 7. On the occasional placing of *αὐτοῦ* between the article and the substantive, particularly where, as here, this position is occupied also by another attributive expression, see A. Buttmann, p. 116. On the exact force of *ἔλεος* as distinguished from *χάρις*, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 47.—The immediate purpose of God in His work of grace is set forth in the form "that we may enjoy (*εἰς*) a hope which has life," *i.e.* not merely "which has vividness and energy," but particularly (*ζῶσαν* being taken in its fullest sense, as *ἄφθαρτον* and *ἀμάραντον* in the parallel clause which follows seem to suggest) "which is imperishable,"—sustained by divine grace, and certainly coming through eternity to ever fuller fruition (cf. i. 23; John iv. 10, vi. 51, vii. 38). "Living" is a favourite epithet with Peter; besides i. 23 just referred to, cf. also ii. 4, 5.

The connection in which the last words of the verse, *δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰ. Χ. ἐκ νεκρῶν*, are meant to be taken, is not clear. They may with equal grammatical propriety be attached to *ἀναγεννήσας* or to *ζῶσαν*. If we adopt the former of these constructions, various meanings are possible. (1) The participle may point to the time of the actual regeneration of each believer, and the sense might be, perhaps, "who regenerated us through Christ's resurrection *believed in*," "through Christ's resurrection as that which, when believed in, gave us full trust in Him, being seen by us to seal all His claims and all His promises." This seems to be a strained and unnatural interpretation of the expression, "through Christ's resurrection." (2) The participle may point to the time of our Lord's resurrection, in which case the meaning will be that then God (virtually) "introduced us and all the rest of Christ's people into newness of life by raising our Head from the dead." This mode of representing the relation between Christians and their Lord—the dependence of our

life upon His—is very common in the writings of Paul; cf. *e.g.* Eph. ii. 4–6; Col. iii. 1. But it is to be observed that the representation of the case given here by Peter's word ἀναγεννήσας is considerably different from that of Paul, who to express the thought uses such terms as συνζωοποιεῖν and συνεγείρειν. With these the Lord's resurrection has a most exact and manifest accordance, whereas Peter's word pictures the great spiritual change not as a rising from the dead, but as the origination of a new life by *birth*. Now with this the resurrection of our Lord corresponds only in a remote way. It is true that in Col. i. 18 and Rev. i. 5 our Lord is called πρωτότοκος (ἐκ) τῶν νεκρῶν, language in which evidently His resurrection is conceived of as a birth from the dark womb of the grave; and that one or two other modes of expression elsewhere in N. T. appear to imply the same metaphor (thus, perhaps, for example, ὠδῖνας in Acts ii. 24). But to that considerably harder and more obscure application of this figure, with the *secondary* reference, which, according to the view now under discussion, we are to recognise in the passage before us, there does not appear to be any analogy. "Regeneration through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" is a thought peculiar, unique indeed, and, as regards its precise sense, obscure. (3) Taking the verb ἀναγεννάω with a secondary force, the clause may be regarded (so Huther) as meaning "who awoke or aroused us anew to hope when we were in gloom and despair." But that the verb is to be taken in this way is far from likely, when we consider the definiteness of the conception of regeneration throughout the N. T., the fact that the apostle employs the word with its proper force in ver. 23, and the perfect suitableness of this proper force in the present place,—its special fitness, indeed, in the relation borne by the verb to εἰς κληρονομίαν which follows.

If we join δι' ἀναστάσεως κτλ. in construction with ζῶσαν, we have an interesting and beautiful thought given us, which is perfectly lucid, and is as fully relevant to the apostle's purpose as any form of thought yielded by the other connection.

According to this view of the construction, the hope into which God introduces us by regeneration "has life through the resurrection of Christ." Hopes which are only of the earth have the curse of death upon them: they fail of realization, or, if they are realized in form, anticipated happiness is yet not attained. But the hope of those to whom God gives the new life of His children has itself life, and this through the triumphant rising of the Lord, their Representative and Head. The sense yielded by this connection of the words is clear, suitable, and beautiful; and this construction seems on the whole preferable to the other. It has approved itself to Oecumenius, Bengel, Steiger, De Wette, Hofmann, and other expositors.

Ver. 4. Thus far, in describing the position of privilege into which God's grace brings His people through regeneration, the apostle has spoken of what is *subjective*, "hope,"—his special thought being, it is likely (considering the meaning of ἀναγεννήσας and of κληρονομίαν,—cf. Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7), "hope *as a son*." In ζῶσαν a specialty of the hope of the child of God has been presented, this epithet implying a security of permanence which is wholly wanting to mere earthly hopes. In εἰς κληρονομίαν we pass to an express assurance that, as certainly as God's children are begotten again to enjoy the *hope* of inheritance, are they begotten again to enjoy the inheritance itself.—By one or two expositors, indeed (as Jachmann), it has been proposed to construe εἰς κληρονομίαν, not as co-ordinate with εἰς ἐλπίδα of ver. 3, but as *dependent* on ἐλπίδα (cf. ἐλπίσατε ἐπί, ver. 13), —thus, "hope towards, or for, an inheritance," = ἐλπίδα κληρονομίας. But nothing whatever favours this connection. The sense which it yields is less forcible than that of the other; and the usage of the language and the balance of the sentence are both against it.

As usual in the N. T. representation (*e.g.* Col. iii. 24; Heb. ix. 15), the "inheritance" spoken of is the blessedness and glory of heaven, the spiritual privileges enjoyed by the Christian in this life being merely the ἀρραβών (Eph. i. 14).

To this inheritance the apostle ascribes attributes by which it is strikingly contrasted with the heritages of earth. It is ἄφθαρτος, insusceptible either of decay from within or of injury from without; ἀμίαντος, absolutely free from moral taint or stain, such as is so apt to attach directly or indirectly to the possessions and inheritances of this world (hence our Lord's μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας, Luke xvi. 9); and ἀμάραντος (cf. the sister form in v. 4), never in any degree losing the power to satisfy, not merely in its nature imperishable, but retaining for ever the bloom and fragrance of its joys. On ἄφθαρτος and ἀμάραντος, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 68.—This great inheritance, Peter says further, though as yet only an object of hope, is in safe keeping. "To keep in store, keep for after bestowal," is a common N. T. sense of τηρεῖν (cf. *e.g.* John ii. 10, xii. 7), and is especially frequent in Peter (cf. 2 Ep. ii. 4, 9, 17, iii. 7). Peter's word τετηρημένην here answers to Paul's ἀποκειμένην, Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 8.—The frequent use in N. T. of the plural οὐρανοί is probably due to a natural imitation of the Hebrew *plurale tantum* שָׁמַיִם, which received its plural form, perhaps, through the tendency of Hebrew to express in this way the notion of extension. In this case, however, the general notion defined itself into a prevalent conception "of a celestial structure rising by storeys, three or seven, advancing in brightness and glory. Of this idea there is a clear illustration in Heb. iv. 14; Eph. iv. 10" (T. S. Green, *Crit. Notes*, on Luke x. 18, 20).

The transition from ἡμᾶς of ver. 3 to ὑμᾶς of ver. 4 is quite natural. The early clauses are purely a doxology, and the thought of "*our* regeneration"—of the divine goodness in this to the apostle himself as to other Christians—was prominent. But under the easily understood movement of the apostle's mind the sentence bends itself towards that practical end of counselling and sustaining his brethren which was before his thoughts from the beginning: thus ὑμᾶς enters.—Εἰς ὑμᾶς, "unto you, with a view to you," differs from the dative very nearly as in English "for" from "to," when we

speak of "giving to" but of "keeping for." An interval of time is suggested, with also, in certain connections, the action of an intermediate agent; cf. vv. 10, 11; Mark viii. 19; Acts xxiv. 17; Eph. iii. 2; and see T. S. Green, *N. T. Gram.* p. 212.

Ver. 5. The main purpose of this clause is evidently to sustain Christians against the fear of coming short of heaven, —to answer the cry of the anxious heart, "We doubt not that the inheritance is kept safe, but amid the temptations of the world what security have we that we shall not be swept far away from it?" To this natural question the apostle replies, "Be of good cheer, for as certainly as heaven is kept by God for His people, they are guarded by Him for heaven." Bengel with characteristic pointedness says: Hereditas servata est; heredes custodiuntur; neque illa his neque hi deerunt illi. *Φρουρουμένους*—with its military metaphor, "kept safe as in a *φρούριον*" (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 32; Phil. iv. 7) —is obviously a word peculiarly fitted to sustain Christians when distressed by the thought of the number and power of their spiritual foes; and to this fitness contributes also the fact that the form here is that of the *present* participle, "who (already at the present moment) are within this glorious guardianship."

The words *ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ* have been by some supposed to represent the power of God as itself the fortress (*φρούριον*) within which Christians are guarded. This is perhaps giving greater detail and exactness to what appears to be a mere passing figure than is natural. Substantially the same sense is obtained in a perfectly satisfactory way by accepting the force of *ἐν* already seen in *ἐν ἁγιασμῷ* (ver. 2), and so familiar everywhere in Hellenistic Greek, for position within an encompassing element or atmosphere which exerts an instrumental influence on the matter in hand. The power of God is an atmosphere surrounding and pervading the Christian, through which he is shielded from evil. When *ἐν*, employed in this way, and *διά* come together, as here, *ἐν*

sets forth a *general* causal or instrumental influence, whilst διά exhibits the *special and immediate* instrumentality; cf. Heb. x. 10, Phil. i. 26, and see a not very satisfactory note in Winer, p. 486. In the present case, faith is the spiritual energy which enables the Christian to resist temptation successfully, and keeps him in that relation to God whereby is secured his ultimate enjoyment of the blessed inheritance of the saints,—πίστις thus being within and under the action of the δύναμις Θεοῦ. It is the encompassing, protecting, sustaining power of God which gives to faith that certainty of continued efficiency here asserted of it by the apostle. Peter had very special cause to remember that the continued existence of faith, as well as its origination, is absolutely dependent on the gracious exercise of "the power of God;" see Luke xxii. 32.

The words which follow, εἰς σωτηρίαν κτλ., are by some expositors joined to ἀναγεννήσας (ver. 3), the amplification of the thought of that verb by εἰς being taken to be threefold, εἰς ἐλπίδα, εἰς κληρονομίαν, εἰς σωτηρίαν. The rhetorical roundness of expression thus obtained hardly accords with the apostle's general style; and a more serious ground of doubt whether this is the intended construction, lies in the fact that whilst there is a real advance of thought from the subjective "hope" to the objective "inheritance," there is no advance from "inheritance" to "salvation,"—these two, as the words are here used, being (cf. Heb. i. 14) as nearly as possible equivalent to each other. The ordinary construction, which takes the words εἰς σωτηρίαν κτλ. as stating the aim of φρουρουμένους κτλ., is much more natural. Instead of presenting this aim simply by εἰς αὐτήν (viz. τὴν κληρονομίαν), the apostle yet more fully illustrates his subject by substituting σωτηρίαν (cf. σωτηρίας—χάριτος, ver. 10), and for the further comfort and stimulus of his brethren appends the assurance that not merely are the blessings which are represented by this word laid up in the heavens, but that they are fully prepared, "ready" to be bestowed at the appointed time (cf. our Lord's ἑτοιμάζειν, John xiv. 2, 3). The use of

σωτηρία, as here, for the *fulness* of salvation to be reached in the future life, is very common in N. T.; cf. *e.g.* Rom. xiii. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 10.—The use of the aorist ἀποκαλυφθῆναι brings before us the sudden flashing forth of the glory of salvation on the sight of God's children, when the appointed day of revelation comes; cf. Rom. viii. 18: τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι. In v. 1, Peter has τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης, where the suddenness and vividness of the revelation are not made prominent,—the thought, perhaps, being rather of the revelation as *beginning* at our Lord's coming, to grow fuller and richer throughout eternity.—Καιρός is freely used by the apostle, as by the other Hellenistic writers, in the sense of "a defined time" generally, not limited, as commonly in the classics, to "an opportune time;" cf. i. 11, iv. 17, v. 6. The revelation of full salvation is to be made "in (or at) the last time,"—the time which is to end the history of the world under its present conditions of contending truth and falsehood, mingled happiness and misery; cf. the use of ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα, John vi. 39, xi. 24, xii. 48.

Vv. 6–9. With regard to some parts of this sub-section the question arises whether the reference is to the present or to the future condition of believers. Obviously, so far as surface indications go, the present is spoken of, the main verbs being in the present tense. Looking a little more closely, however, we find that the language in which Christian joy is described is so very strong that it may seem inapplicable to the experiences of earth,—ἀγαλλιᾶν, itself a verb expressive of a high degree of joy, having attached to it the exceedingly emphatic words χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ. The statement, ἀγαλλιᾶσθε λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, appears to bring this inapplicability prominently into view, and may be thought indeed to involve a distinct self-contradiction on the supposition that the main verb, as well as the participle, relates to the earthly life. The fact, too, that this participle is aorist may be judged to accord best with the supposition that the time of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε is that of the heavenly life,

when the λυπηθῆναι will have for ever passed away,—"after having been distressed." Again, the clause forming ver. 9, which is attached to ἀγαλλιᾶτε, and seemingly belongs to the same time as that verb, may appear to be suited only to the *perfect* emancipation from sin and sorrow. Still further,—it being to a certain extent characteristic of the apostle's style to begin sentences after the Latin fashion, with a relative pronoun referring to a subject spoken of in the preceding sentence, and particularly at the close of the preceding sentence (cf. vv. 8, 10), ἐν ᾧ at the beginning of ver. 6 may seem to refer to ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, and to mean "at which time," that is, the time of the Lord's appearing. If these arguments be sound, then ἀγαλλιᾶσθε of ver. 6 and ἀγαλλιᾶτε of ver. 8 are to be regarded as what may be called presents of vivid prophecy, used in place of a future tense (cf. παραδίδοται, Matt. xxvi. 2; καταργεῖται, 1 Cor. xv. 26). This view of the meaning of the passage has commended itself to a large number of excellent interpreters, including, of the more recent, Wiesinger, Huther, and Alford.

Had the passage ended with the 7th verse, few probably would have differed from them, seeing that the obvious antithesis in ἄρτι λυπηθέντες to the thought, expressed or implied, of the future blessedness, suggests quite naturally the taking of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε as a present of vivid prediction. But it is plain that vv. 8, 9 are closely connected with vv. 6, 7, the whole constituting one paragraph. Vv. 8, 9, indeed, substantially, though with some difference in the mode of representation, take up and expand the leading thought of ver. 6, ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, which, through the coming in of the long subordinate clause on suffering and its aim, had there been exhibited only in the barest way. Whatever is the reference of ἀγαλλιᾶτε in ver. 8, then, is also naturally taken to be the reference of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε in ver. 6. Now to take the verb in ver. 8 as referring to the future involves very grave difficulties. That in the two relative clauses which appear to be so closely parallel to each other, ὃν οὐκ

κτλ. and εἰς ὃν ἄρτι κτλ., the verb of the one, ἀγαπᾶτε, should be a real present (which beyond all question it is), and the verb of the other, ἀγαλλιᾶτε, should be a present in form merely, with its real time future, is very unlikely. Again, that in the second of these relative clauses the participles belonging to ἀγαλλιᾶτε should relate to a different time from their main verb (both their meaning and the particle ἄρτι distinctly showing them to refer to the present life), and this without any τότε (1 Cor. xiii. 12), or ἐν οὐρανοῖς, or other indication that ἀγαλλιᾶτε is in time severed from its participles and belongs to the future,—this is unnatural in the very highest degree. As regards the structure of the second relative clause, moreover,—supposing that ἀγαλλιᾶτε be taken as in meaning future, with its participles true presents, the antithesis between the described experience of Christians "now" (ἄρτι), "Ye see Him not, but believe in Him," and their described experience in the future, "Ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory," is plainly imperfect, and imperfect in a way which in such a sentence is not natural, —some such statement as ἀγαλλιᾶτε ὁρῶντες αὐτὸν καθώς ἐστι being required.

Still further,—on the supposition that the references in this sub-section to the joy of Christians relate to the future life, it would be hard to see any definite purpose consistently followed out through the passage. As a whole, no doubt, the verses would contain a sketch of the blessedness of "the salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (ver. 5), setting forth its exceeding joy in contrast with the sorrows of the present life. Now, supposing this to be the apostle's general aim in writing the passage, the clause "whom having not seen ye love," seems to come in somewhat irrelevantly. On the other hand, supposing the whole passage to refer to the *present* life, a consistent purpose can be traced out to the remotest ramifications of the sentence. In this case the apostle appears to be illustrating, not the closing words, but the central thought, of ver. 5, namely that the children of

God are guarded by His power through faith unto salvation,—expanding particularly the idea "through faith," and, by an appeal to the experience which his readers already had of the power of faith, strengthening their hope that by God's grace faith would sustain them through to glory. "Think," he says to them, "of what you already know on this matter by experience. Through the thought of heaven presented to you vividly by faith you have great happiness, even though at the present for wise reasons you have not a few troubles, at times sore troubles. Hard as it is to cherish strong affection for one whom you have never seen, still, as your consciousness tells you, you are enabled by faith to do this. Hard as it is to have, or even to conceive of one having, intense pleasure in a kind of intercourse with another which is not maintained through any bodily sense, but is purely spiritual, still you have such joy, unspeakable, and, as you feel, of heavenly origin. In these fruits of faith—loving fellowship with Christ, and the exquisite and sublime happiness which such fellowship yields—you possess already the essential elements of heavenly blessedness. You are thus already in such measure receiving that end which your faith teaches you to long and to hope for, even the salvation of your souls, that you may well repose unwavering trust in the power of God, acting through the faith which He sustains, as able, notwithstanding all the distractions and oppositions of the world, to bring you safe to that fulness of salvation which yet remains to be revealed." The view of the apostle's object set forth in this paraphrase seems to accord with the whole structure of the passage; and the prominent way in which πίστις and πιστεύειν are used in the section appears to show that something of this kind really was his line of thought.

The arguments urged in favour of taking the paragraph with a future reference look less strong after close examination than they do at first sight; and, on the whole, the difficulties in the way of accepting the *prima facie* reference of the passage to the present life appear to be considerably

less weighty than those which beset the other view. The language employed of Christian joy is undoubtedly very rich and intense, richer and intenser than accords with the average spiritual happiness of most believers; but probably every Christian has a remembrance of some times of peculiarly close communion with the Saviour, for which no words less strong than those of the apostle would seem fit. Not a few Christians have many such seasons. Now, if the apostle's purpose was to point out to his readers what great things faith can do, as illustrated already in their own experience, then the *memory* of times of "joy unspeakable and full of glory" was enough for his object, since every believer feels that such rich spiritual happiness is a fruit of lively faith, and that, if he has but little of it, this is due mainly to his living, through worldly influences, on a low level of faith. Other points will be dealt with in the course of exposition.

Ver. 6. *Ἐν ᾧ* may have *καιρῷ* as its antecedent, the meaning being either "at which (time),"—a sense suitable only on the supposition that the paragraph refers to the future, —or "at (or in) which," with the force of "in the thought or anticipation of which," *ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι*, like *χαίρειν* and other verbs of rejoicing, taking *ἐν* to express its ground or basis (cf. John v. 35). But the most natural construction seems to be, keeping to this latter force of *ἐν*, to take the pronoun as neuter, its antecedent being the gracious assurance contained in the previous sentence generally (cf. iv. 4).—The Hellenistic verb *ἀγαλλιάομαι* looks like a strengthened form for the classical *ἀγάλλομαι*, with which it agrees in meaning. A. Buttmann, however (*Gram.* p. 51, note), observing it to be often used in the LXX. for the Hebrew גִּיל, inclines to regard it as having arisen among the Greek-speaking Jews out of this Hebrew word, the *Yod* by a phonetic change familiar to philologists being represented by an *iota* put *after* the liquid, and the form perhaps influenced somewhat by the Greek verb *ἀγάλλομαι*. The word is a very strong one, "rejoice exceedingly, exult." Besides that thought of a reference to the

future to which this strength of the language employed has led many interpreters, and which has already been discussed, the form ἀγαλλιᾶσθε is by some (as Augustine) on the same ground supposed to be perhaps imperative instead of indicative. The imperative, however, would be abrupt and not very natural here, and is wholly unnatural in the 8th verse. But the indicative employed to set forth the *ideal* of Christian experience, as often in Scripture, has really to the mind of every thoughtful believer the force of an imperative.

The next clause, ὀλίγον κτλ., sets forth a difficulty in the way of ἀγαλλίασις, by which the sublime power of faith, in enabling the Christians addressed actually ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, is vividly illustrated. The participle, λυπηθέντες, has evidently its common concessive force, "though distressed:" cf. John xii. 37; 1 Cor. ix. 19. Ἄρτι simply contrasts the present life with that of heaven,—in which (ἐν ᾧ), as an object of thought and hope, the believer has his joy,—and therefore the aorist participle might conceivably point to a past within this present life. But the whole tone of the Epistle shows that with very many of the apostle's readers the λυπεῖσθαι was a present experience, and quite obviously the natural supplement to εἰ δέον is the present ἐστίν (which, as a matter of fact, is found in very many MSS.). Peter's thought, therefore, seems clearly to be of joy, not after, but in the midst of trouble, exactly as Paul's "distressed (λυπούμενοι), yet always rejoicing," "exceeding joyful in all our tribulation" (2 Cor. vi. 10, vii. 4). Our apostle's choice of the aorist participle instead of the present seems to have been made to indicate—quite in accordance with the regular force of this tense, and with many analogies as regards this particular kind of application (cf. Donaldson, *Gr. Gram.* § 427, especially section *dd*)—the *transitoriness* of earthly trouble, "but for a moment," when viewed in the light of eternity. Trouble is to the Christian as a passing wreath of cloud, obscuring the sun for an instant,—already past almost before it was recognised. This

force of the aorist cannot well be brought out in an English rendering; we seem obliged to translate by the present, "though ye are distressed, put to grief." Another possible explanation of the choice of the aorist here, one which has to be given of the use of this tense not unfrequently in N. T. (cf. *eg.* Jas. v. 4-6), is that the apostle throws his mind forward—as from his immediately preceding strain of remark, which is referred to by ἐν ᾧ, he quite naturally might do—to the future life, and from it looks back on the earthly troubles, now all past. This conception of the form of the thought—which the presence of ἄρτι in the clause seems to make hardly so likely a one as the other—appears to be that which is represented in the R. E. V.—The sense of ὀλίγον in N. T. varies between reference to degree, "a little, slightly" (as Luke vii. 47), and reference to time, "for a little" (as Mark vi. 31). Either of these would in a measure suit the present passage, either, as Paul has it, "our light affliction," or, "which is but for a moment;" but in the connection brevity seems most likely the intended thought.

The interjected conditional clause, εἰ δέον (ἐστιν), prepares the minds of the readers to receive aright the mention of their sore troubles, by recalling to them the truth that these come to believers only at the time, and in the measure, in which their heavenly Father sees affliction to be needful for the soul's welfare. The force of εἰ with the present indicative is often shown by the context to be "if (as is the case)"—that is, practically, in such a connection as here, "since." But all that this form of construction in itself indicates is that the condition is with special vividness assumed to be realized,—uncertainty, though out of view, not being denied; and in the present case nothing calls on us to think that the apostle intended to be more definite than "if it is needful." Many of the Christians of Asia Minor might not actually at the time be exposed to any special troubles.—Ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, "in (and thus through) manifold trials," varied discipline according to varied "needs." Πειρασμός is here, as

often elsewhere in N. T., applied, like "trial" in English, specially to affliction looked upon as a testing agency; cf. Luke xxii. 28; Acts xx. 19; Jas. i. 2.—By persons who look at the matter from a merely earthly point of view, the judgement might readily be formed that Peter's statement here, ἀγαλλιᾶσθε λυπηθέντες, or as Paul has it, λυπούμενοι, ἀεὶ δὲ χαίροντες (2 Cor. vi. 10), is self-contradictory. The apostles do not stop to say anything in bar of this judgement. They are writing for men of spiritual discernment; and the Christian consciousness knows perfectly that there is no inconsistency. Says Calvin (*in loc.*): "Melius experimento norunt fideles illos contrarios affectus simul consistere, quam verbis exprimi queat."

Ver. 7. This verse contains an explicit statement of the gracious divine purpose in affliction,—which has been implied in εἰ δέον (ver. 6). Whilst the general meaning of the sentence is plain, the exact form of the thought is not altogether obvious. *Prima facie*, "the trial of faith" is said to be "more precious than gold." Now, according to the proprieties of the figure, it is faith itself of which this would naturally be predicated. The simplest and most satisfactory explanation of the little difficulty appears to be that which is implied in the rendering of the A. E. V., "than *of* gold," —namely that, immediately, the comparison instituted is not between faith and gold, but between the trial of faith and the trial of gold, and that by a slight inaccuracy of expression (*comparatio compendiaria*)—found occasionally, no doubt, in every language, in inartificial speaking or writing, and particularly common in Greek—the link τοῦ δοκιμίου is left out, so that we read "than gold," whilst the intended meaning is, "than that of gold;" cf. Matt. v. 20; John v. 36; and see Jelf, § 781; Winer, p. 307; A. Buttmann, p. 168. Cf. also 1 John ii. 2, where the antithesis with ἡμετέρων makes the supposition of a very similar irregularity of construction, περὶ τοῦ κόσμου for περὶ τῶν (ἁμαρτιῶν) τοῦ κόσμου, greatly more probable than that of an intended change in the form

of thought; see the full regular expression in Heb. vii. 27. The other possible explanation supposes something of irregularity in the form, not of the predicate, but of the subject, taking "the trial of your faith" to mean "your tried (and approved) faith." This running together of the meaning of the two substantives seems to be without adequate analogy, particularly seeing that, not δοκιμή, but the more stubborn and decidedly concrete-looking form δοκίμιον is used. Dr. Hort (*Gr. Test., App.*, note *in loc.*), supposing "approved faith" to be the subject of comparison, and feeling that δοκίμιον does not at all naturally yield this sense, is inclined to regard as the true reading the neuter adjective δόκιμον, which is found as a variant, but only in three or four cursive MSS.,—τὸ δόκιμον, "the approved excellence," needing less force than the other to give the desired sense. This seems to be an entirely gratuitous resort to a kind of refuge legitimate only in a case of desperation. The similarity both of thought and of phraseology gives good ground for believing that in this verse and the preceding Peter had Jas. i. 3 before his mind; and it is natural to suppose, unless our apostle's course of thought require a different sense to be put on the words, that he uses τὸ δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως with the same meaning as James, which is quite unequivocally "the testing of faith." Now, instead of being in any way alien from Peter's line of thought, this sense fits in with it perfectly; for in this parenthetical verse — introduced to explain the apparently anomalous fact that those who were children of God and heirs of heaven were "distressed through manifold trials"— the immediate subject of thought is clearly not the value of faith, but the value of the testing of faith by suffering. Supposing this to be the subject, moreover, all the parts of the sentence come in in an obviously orderly way, and with, as it appears, somewhat more of relevancy and force than if we regard the subject to be "your approved faith." If instead of "testing, trial," we were to take δοκίμιον in what seems to be its first meaning, "test," and suppose the immediate com-

parison to be between affliction, the test of faith, and fire, the test of gold, the course of thought would be substantially the same; but this mode of looking at the matter is not very natural, does not well accord with the relegation of *διὰ πυρός* to a position in a secondary clause, and differs from James's use of *δοκίμιον*. On *δοκίμιον*, found in N. T. only here and in the passage in James, cf. particularly Fritzsche, *Prälim.* p. 40.

Πολυτιμότερον is best taken (so both A. and R. E. V.) in apposition with *δοκίμιον*. If it be joined with *εὑρεθῇ* as a part of the predicate—in which case, of course, the words *εἰς ἔπαινον κτλ.* are viewed as appended in a loose adverbial way, to set forth the ultimate issues—the sentence moves more heavily. Moreover, whether the subject spoken of is held to be "faith" or "the testing of faith," the apostle, writing to Christians, would be likely to assume their knowledge that this was more valuable than gold or than the testing of gold, rather than to describe a certain divine procedure as chosen with the view of their by and by finding it to be more valuable; whereas with respect to the much stronger predication *εὑρεθῇ εἰς ἔπαινον κτλ.* the same difficulty does not present itself.—The article, which *χρυσίου*, being taken in its widest generality, would naturally have, is omitted, as frequently where an attribute with the article follows; cf. Jelf, § 458; Winer, p. 174; A. Buttmann, p. 93.

The thought yielded by the rendering which the A. E. V. gives of the clause *τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου κτλ.*, "that perisheth though it be tried with (is proved by, R. E. V.) fire," is natural and relevant: "the trial of faith is more valuable—more precious, from the nature of its issues—than the trial of gold; inasmuch as gold, even though tried by fire, must ultimately perish like other corruptible things, whereas faith carries down to eternity all the gain which its trials give it." But this thought does not seem to come easily out of the apostle's words. The only way in which it can be reached

is this,—"which perisheth,"—(then, parenthetically) "and yet it was tested by fire." Now, certainly, for this sense the natural form of the participle would have been the aorist or perfect instead of the present. The thought yielded by the *prima facie* rendering of the words, "which perisheth, but (yet) is tested by fire," is one which also quite suits the context. "Of such value is the trying of gold considered by men to be, that though the metal so highly esteemed by them is perishable, and though in the crucible not dross only may be removed, but some of the gold itself may be lost, still it is tried by fire. This analogy from men's mode of dealing with their precious things may help us to recognise the wisdom and kindness of God, when to a more valuable kind of testing He subjects our faith,—which, as we know, is imperishable, suffering through the crucible of affliction into which it is cast absolutely no loss."

In the spiritual sphere this earthly life is, as regards issues of thought, effort, hope, largely a time of seeking: the day of "the revelation of Jesus Christ" will be the season of finding. To this end, the apostle says, God appoints affliction to His people as a purifying agency,—that in that great day of discoveries this trial of their faith "may be found unto—*i.e.* certainly issuing in—praise and glory and honour." The construction εὑρεθῆναι εἰς is not common, and this is an argument which has been used in favour of our taking the predicate of the sentence to be εὑρεθῇ πολυτιμότερον. The combination, however,—which, from the force of εἰς, and the readiness with which the mind supplies an ὄν in connection with εὑρεθῇ, is in itself a perfectly natural and intelligible one, — does occur, quite certainly, notwithstanding Steiger's argument to the contrary, in Rom. vii. 10.—Some interpreters have minutely distinguished the three substantives here employed,—ἔπαινος being the praise given from the throne by the Divine Judge,—δόξα, the admission into His glory following thereon,—and τιμή, the honour among the angels and glorified saints consequent on the ἔπαινος and δόξα.

It may be doubted whether, in a passage like the present, such rigid exactness of dealing with a group of terms of this kind is altogether justified. It seems rather as if the apostle, labouring under a sense of the immeasurable glory of the inheritance of the saints, simply piles up word upon word as if to overwhelm utterly the remembrance of the λυπηθῆναι ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς: as Beza has it, "quibus nimirum synonymis voluit Petrus tentationum dedecus et ignominiam obtegere."

A passage in Hermas (*Vis.* iv. 3) is somewhat parallel to this verse, and possibly a reminiscence,—the language, however, being too general and the figure too obvious and common to permit any definite conclusion on this head: ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ χρυσίον δοκιμάζεται διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ εὔχρηστον γίνεται, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς δοκιμάζεσθε.

Ver. 8. This verse evidently resumes and expands the thought contained in ver. 6, ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε,—which was there expressed only in the briefest way, in consequence of the entering in of the weighty subsidiary clause, forming ver. 7, on the purpose of affliction. In taking up the thought again, the apostle presents it in a most interesting and beautiful form, immediately and naturally suggested by the mention of the Saviour's name at the close of the previous verse. In ver. 6 he said, "Ye exult in the contemplation and hope of heaven;" here he dwells particularly on the power exerted over the heart of the Christian by the one most precious element in his thoughts with respect to heaven,—the thought that his Redeemer is there, and that, through the communion which He holds with His people now, He is preparing them for the time when they too shall be there, and see Him as He is. Peter here brings into much prominence the fact that an *unseen* Saviour is at the present the object of the Christian's affection and the source of his joy; evidently setting this fact forth as, for all who know the vastness of the power exercised over men by what is visible and tangible, a most impressive proof of the sublime

and divinely sustained energy of Christian faith,—thus confirming the assurance of ver. 5 that the children of God "are guarded through the power of God by faith unto salvation." This same thought, of the extreme difficulty for a creature like man of being filled with love for an object unseen, presents itself in a different connection in 1 John iv. 20. Peter brings the point forward in two aspects. First, "You have not seen Him, and yet you love Him." Then he passes on from the historic, "not having seen," to the present, "not seeing." This is climactic. "To declare that not having seen Him you love Him, is to say a great thing regarding the power of faith; but it is even a greater to say that from day to day, not seeing Him, but simply believing in Him, you have through that faith exulting delight in Him."

The difference of the negative particle in what appear to be precisely parallel statements, *οὐκ ἰδόντες, μὴ ὁρῶντες*, arrests attention. In the later Greek the particle *μή* came to be used with increasing frequency in participial clauses, even in cases where the subjective element of thought was not naturally very prominent; until in the Greek of the present day a participle negatived always takes *μή*. In the language of N. T., whilst *μή* is found with participles much oftener than *οὐ*, still there are only a very few passages in which the distinctive force of this particle cannot be clearly recognised; though, no doubt, in a considerable number of those cases in which a subjective force *can* be recognised, a classical writer would probably have chosen rather to set forth simply the objective fact; cf. Winer, p. 606; A. Buttmann, p. 350. In the place before us, where in clauses so closely similar the apostle employs *οὐ* with the one participle and *μή* with the other, he obviously looked at the two cases in those different lights which the two particles in their strict use indicate. Regarding the Christians whom he addresses, the words *οὐκ ἰδόντες* set forth their not having seen the Lord merely as a fact: *μὴ ὁρῶντες* seems to bring before us their not seeing Him as a fact *present to their own*

thoughts, while yet they were enabled through faith to rejoice in Him. In οὐκ ἰδόντες we have the negation simply as standing before Peter's own mind as an historical fact; and plainly the fact was of a kind fitted particularly to impress a man who, like him, had been a companion of the Lord Jesus, and one which he might very naturally and indeed quite instinctively prefer to look at for a moment by itself, historically merely, — out in the open, so to speak, — rather than as present to the consciousness, and influencing the spiritual exercises, of the believers of and to whom he is speaking. To Peter himself *this* experience was something purely objective, in which he himself had no share, but which in its character was well fitted to impress his mind as an evidence of the glorious power of faith. He himself *had* seen the Lord, and, as the memory of innumerable proofs which he had witnessed of His grace and tenderness came up before him, it seemed to him a most easy and natural thing for *him* to have learned to love Jesus; but for those Christians of Asia Minor, οὐκ ἰδόντας, certainly there was something peculiarly sublime in the power which had taught *them* to love Him. There rose up vividly before the apostle's mind—as the form which the next clause takes leads one to think—a remembrance of our Lord's words about the peculiar blessedness of those who, "not having seen, believe" (John xx. 29). With regard to the second case, μὴ ὁρῶντες, πιστεύοντες δέ, the apostle's experience was substantially *the same* as that of the brethren to whom he wrote. He, like them, had often felt the chilling influence which is exerted on the spiritual life of Christians, when unwatchful, by things seen and temporal; and yet he and they, μὴ ὁρῶντες, "not seeing their Redeemer, and fully conscious of this," exulted in Him. The οὐ and the μή respectively are plainly used with entire naturalness in the two places; cf. a somewhat parallel case, Matt. xxii. 11, 12. On the testimony to the genuineness of the Epistle afforded by the obviously unforced autoptic touch in this clause, see Introduction, § I. 5.

In the clause εἰς ὃν κτλ., these first words belong in construction to the participle πιστεύοντες. The combination εἰς ὅν, indeed, is no doubt one which readily permits its force to pass over in a loose way to the main verb ἀγαλλιᾶτε, but not so exactly as "in whom" does in English. Ἀγαλλιᾶν and the verbs of its class are not construed with εἰς, and ὁρᾶν is so only exceptionally, and in a different sense from that here required (cf. John xiv. 37, with Meyer's note). But πιστεύειν often takes εἰς; and, the chief subject of the whole section (vv. 6–9) being the power of faith as already proved in the spiritual experiences of Christians, the thought mainly in the writer's mind from the beginning of the present clause was naturally that of "believing," εἰς ὃν πιστεύοντες; whilst to the interjected μὴ ὁρῶντες the mind at once supplies αὐτόν, and to ἀγαλλιᾶτε, ἐν αὐτῷ.—The rare active form ἀγαλλιᾶν occurs also in Luke i. 47; Rev. xix. 7; the passage in Luke, however, being the only one of the three where the middle is not found as a variant. Assuming the active to be the true reading here, it would seem, from its being used so soon after the middle (ver. 6), that to Peter the one form came as naturally as the other.

The epithets applied to the joy of believers are peculiarly rich and striking. Ἀνεκλάλητος is a somewhat rare word; see Ignat. *Eph.* § 19; Iren. i. 14. 5; and cf. ἀλάλητος, Rom. viii. 26. By δεδοξασμένη Christian joy is described as in its nature distinctly heavenly. Like the face of Moses (τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, 2 Cor. iii. 7), or of Stephen (Acts vi. 15), it is touched with a beam from above, reflecting the glory of God.

Ver. 9. Several even of those expositors who admit the previous verses of the paragraph to refer to Christian experience in the present life think of this verse as pointing to the future, somewhat thus: "receiving by and by, as ye know that ye are to do, the end of your faith." This is wholly unnatural. Had Peter meant this he would

certainly have used the future, the form which he actually has in the only other places where he employs the verb *κομίζεσθαι* (v. 4; 2 Ep. ii. 13, the reading in this latter passage, however, being doubtful). The clause explains and justifies the exultant hope of believers by exhibiting their present position, describing them as already enjoying in a measure, and according to the intelligence and liveliness of their faith knowing themselves to be enjoying, the essential elements of the life eternal. In their peace of conscience, fellowship with God, growth in holy beauty and energy, they were already receiving to some extent "the end" to which their faith looked, and for which it longed, "the salvation of their souls." From the nature of the truth of which faith lays hold, this "end" begins to be gained from the very commencement of true faith in any soul. It is gained always more as faith grows in intelligence and strength, until in heaven it is attained perfectly. This "end of faith" is described by the apostle in the most general way, without articles, "salvation of souls," as if leaving to his readers room for expatiating in all directions in the contemplation of the breadth and length and depth and height of this sublime blessing. In naming specially the salvation of the "*soul*," the apostle brings out distinctly the radical and therefore gloriously complete nature of the deliverance; cf. Jas. i. 2; Heb. x. 39. It does not seem to be over-refining, too, to say that whilst the apostle is no doubt thinking of salvation in its fulness (as the unquestionably general *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας* which follows shows), yet his form of expression gives prominence to that sphere or element in which his readers were actually in the present life *κομιζόμενοι σωτηρίαν*,—"the body, indeed, being dead because of sin, but the spirit being life because of righteousness" (Rom. viii. 10).

Vv. 10–12. *Confirmation of what has been said regarding the greatness and the certainty of the Christian salvation, by a reference to the deep interest taken in everything connected with it by prophets and by angels.*

Ver. 10. On the spelling (late, and perhaps mainly Alexandrian), ἐραυνᾶν for ἐρευνᾶν, prevalent in the oldest texts of N. T., see particularly Dr. Gregory's *Proleg.* to Tischendorf's 8th ed. p. 81.—It is not needful to distinguish minutely between ἐξεζήτησαν and ἐξηραύνησαν, the two verbs being plainly employed in order to exhibit with special strength their common idea of "seeking." This combination is found also in 1 Macc. ix. 26; and ζητεῖν and ἐξεραυνᾶν are used in a parallelism in Prov. ii. 4.—On the omission of the article with προφῆται, cf. ver. 7, note on χρυσίου. It is possible, however, and not unlikely, that the present is not simply a case of omitting the article in order to lighten a construction. Having regard to the anarthrousness of ἄγγελοι also (ver. 12), it seems as if with both words the apostle, by withholding the article, meant to concentrate the attention of his readers on that dignity of position which is intimated by the designations, and which the article — implying as it does a certain familiarity with the thought—would tend to make less prominent; "prophets—angels—are interested in the gospel." Anarthrousness, obviously or probably with this design of making the substantive or adjective stand out in full prominence, is somewhat favoured by our apostle; cf. λίθον, ii. 4; δίκαιος, iii. 18; κιβωτοῦ, iii. 20; κτίστῃ, iv. 19; and see T. S. Green's *N. T. Gram.* p. 34. Mr. Green appears inclined to think that to this purpose of making the inherent notion of the substantive stand out with vividness is perhaps to be ascribed the whole class of cases where a noun to which an attributive combination is postfixed with the article is itself anarthrous.—Dr. Plumptre (*Cambridge Bible for Schools, in loc.*) has propounded the view that the "prophets" here

spoken of are the eminent class of Christian ministers of the first age called by this name in N. T., such as Silas and Agabus. The ordinary view of the reference has some difficulties, but this has immeasurably more. Dr. Plumptre bravely faces even *προμαρτυρόμενον* and *οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δέ*, but totally fails to make his exegesis look in the smallest degree natural. — Instead of simply referring to *σωτηρίας* by a pronoun, "who prophesied of it," the apostle amplifies (cf. ver. 5, note on *σωτηρίαν*), bringing in a new and most winning description of salvation, *τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος*, "the grace (*i.e.* the gift or manifestation of grace) for you"—"destined for you;" on this use of *εἰς*, cf. *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, ver. 4, note. These words evidently contain in themselves a strong argument. "Ages ago, in the promises of grace given through the prophets, God had *you* in His thoughts: can your faith in Him fail when you remember this?"

Ver. 11. We are here told what were those points with respect to salvation as to which the prophets "made diligent inquiry and search." The coming of a great Deliverer was made known to them,—not a little also, as the prophetic ages rolled on, with regard to the glory of His Person and the nature of His work; but the *time* of the deliverance they were not told. The picture which they were enabled to form in their minds lacked distinctness of perspective. On this point, through the intense interest with which they contemplated the revealed Saviour and His salvation, they earnestly, through prayerful study of the data which they possessed, sought for more light. Their inquiries, we are told, related to *τίνα καιρόν*, "*what* time" God had fixed for the advent of the Deliverer, — and also to *ποῖον καιρόν*, "*what manner* of time," what kind of age in the world's history, politically and morally; cf. Clem. Rom. § 38, *ἀναλογισώμεθα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ποῖοι καὶ τίνες εἰσήλθαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.* One can easily understand how the question with regard to *ποῖον* as well as *τίνα καιρόν* should arise in

their minds. Many of the facts revealed to them respecting Messiah and His work were so strange in themselves, and especially in their combination, that marvel was natural as to what class of circumstances could bring about the realization of such predictions as that the Christ was to be "cut off out of the land of the living"—and to "prolong His days," — to be "forsaken," "bruised," "put to grief" by Jehovah — and to be His "elect," "in whom His soul delighted," — and other similar seeming mutual contradictions.—By some interpreters (as Peile and Mason) *τίνα* is taken as unconnected with *καιρόν*, its meaning being "whom." This is, of course, grammatically possible; but obvious advantage in exegesis would be required to justify disregard of the strong *prima facie* likelihood that in such a clause as the present *τίνα* and *ποῖον* go together in construction. Now, in fact, difficulty arises; for if *τίνα* have a personal reference, this is plainly much the more important of the questions,—yet in what is said in the following verse to have been "revealed" to the prophets there is nothing which seems in any way to relate to such a question.

Εἰς τίνα καιρόν means "with reference to what time," the construction which follows being either that *ἐδήλου* has an understood object, "them," *i.e. τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα κτλ.*, the apostle having already the participial clause so vividly present to his mind that he construes the main verb as if he had expressed that clause before it,—or that *ἐδήλου* and *προμαρτυρόμενον* are to be taken together as conjointly having *τὰ παθήματα κτλ.* as object, thus, "was by prophetic testimony showing" (cf. Acts xxviii. 23, the construction of *ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος*). To suppose *ἐδήλου* used here in an exceptional way as intransitive, and therefore having *εἰς* attached, with the sense "was pointing to," on such an analogy as the rare construction found in John xix. 37, *ὄψονται εἰς*, is unnecessary. — For the expression *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*, see Rom. viii. 9; Phil. i. 19; cf. also Acts xvi. 7

(true reading); Gal. iv. 6. Such a sense of *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* as "the Spirit who spoke of Christ" (Grotius), could not very naturally attach to the words in any circumstances, and here plainly would be utterly tautological. The rendering, "the Spirit who—in the fulness of the times—rested on Christ" (Weiss), is grammatically possible; but a force of the genitive, decidedly different from that which it has in the other places where the combination occurs, is thus introduced without the slightest suggestion in the context. No other force of the expression is in the least degree natural than "the Spirit who is Christ's, and whom He sends forth" (John xv. 26, xvi. 7). "Procul dubio Petrus Spiritum Sanctum Christi Spiritum propterea vocavit, quod Christus, quum, priusquam homo factus esset, divina majestate apud Deum splenderet (Phil. ii. 6), Spiritus Sancti afflatum prophetis dedisset" (C. F. Fritzsche, *Nova Opusc. Acad.* p. 259). This application of the name "Christ" to the Word not yet made flesh is like that of Paul, 1 Cor. x. 4; cf. also John xii. 41. By the function here ascribed to "the Spirit of Christ," as the Teacher of the prophets, He is at once identified with "the Spirit of Jehovah" who "spake by" them (2 Sam. xxiii. 2). The truth that the pre-incarnate Word was the Giver of the Spirit to the prophets was one which much interested the early Fathers; cf. Barnab. § 5, *οἱ προφῆται, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* (*i.e.* Christ) *ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν*,—also Ignat. *Magn.* § 9; Justin Martyr, I. *Apol.* 36, 63; Iren. iv. 20. 4.

In *εἰς Χριστόν* the preposition accords with the prophetic point of view, "destined, appointed, for Christ," exactly as in *τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος* of ver. 10: contrast the form of expression from the eye-witness's point of view, v. 1, *μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων*. By the fact that in the preceding paragraph prominence has been given to the contrast between the sufferings of believers on earth and their glory in heaven, some interpreters have been led to think that in the present verse also the reference is not to Christ

but to His people; and they would translate thus, "the sufferings with relation to Christ" (or "until Christ," *i.e.* until His Second Coming) "and the glories thereafter." Neither of these translations of εἰς is a likely one,—the former, because of its vagueness, seeing that the apostle, if such had been his thought, had the distinct διὰ *Χριστόν* ready at hand, —the latter, because εἰς in the sense of "until," joined to a personal name, is exceedingly rare in N. T., if found at all (cf. the Commentators on Gal. iii. 24). On the other hand, the use of εἰς in the immediately preceding verse, in what *prima facie* appears to be a precisely parallel combination, obviously invites us to take the preposition here in the same sense. There can be no doubt, moreover, that what must mainly have excited the eager inquiries of the prophets, and what the angels mainly desired to look into, was the history of Christ; and to all intelligent believers the sequence of thought in the apostle's letter, supposing the reference here to be to Christ Himself, presents itself at once as most natural, the basis of His people's hopes being His sufferings and glories.—In using the plural of δόξα, a somewhat rare form (in N. T. only in 2 Pet. ii. 10 and Jude 8, in both places in a peculiar sense), the apostle no doubt had in his mind the more or less distinct predictions of the various *stages* of our Lord's course of triumph, the Resurrection, Ascension, Mediatorial Reign, and Second Coming.

Ver. 12. A communication was made by God to the prophets—to the longing heart of each seer, age after age, we may suppose—to the effect that not to themselves but to men of after times they were ministering their revelations respecting Messiah. Of course the reference here is to the blessed realization of the promises in Christ's incarnation and redemptive work: as regarded spiritual benefit, the prophets ministered largely to themselves and their contemporaries (on this see a beautiful paragraph in Leighton). The information given to the prophets in answer to their prayerful longings was probably very general; but the simple announce-

ment of the distant futurity of the Messianic age was sufficient to show them that they did not need detailed knowledge of "what and what manner of time."—Construed as here with an accusative and a dative, διακονεῖν, "to serve," means "to serve one with something,"—in the present instance, of course, "to supply information;" cf. Joseph. *Antiq.* vi. 13. 6. Its object here, αὐτά, "them," "these things," points obviously to τὰ δηλούμενα περὶ τῶν εἰς Χριστὸν παθημάτων κτλ. The rendering of the A. E. V. here seems, as occasionally (cf. Phil. iv. 3), to indicate a certain confusion in the minds of the translators between the force of αὐτός and that of οὗτος. Αὐτά really ends the first half-sentence, and the point perhaps ought to be a semicolon,—the second half-sentence being made up of the two co-ordinate relative clauses, which are attached a little loosely, "the which things," etc.

By some expositors (as Huther, Alford, and Lillie) a different view of the meaning of this first clause of the verse is held. They regard the apostle as speaking, not of a communication made to the prophets after, and in gracious response to, their eager inquiries, but (ἀπεκαλύφθη being taken with that practically pluperfect force which the aorist not unfrequently has, particularly in relative clauses) of a communication given previously—involved, indeed, in those very Messianic revelations which they had received, and which had led to their longings and questionings. The one main statement of the passage is supposed to be that the prophets felt a deep interest in their predictions regarding Christ and His salvation (vv. 10, 11); and the clause οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη κτλ. is thought to be added in a subsidiary way, to show the unselfishness of this interest,—thus, "to whom (however, or, be it noted) it had been revealed (*i.e.* practically, although it had been revealed to them), that it was not to themselves but to you they were ministering the precious things of which they spoke." In this case the apostle's line of thought is—"If the ancient seers, knowing that the Messianic predictions

were not for them, still studied them with earnest love, what should your interest in the contemplation of Christ be, to whom His salvation has actually come!" The grounds urged in support of this view of the meaning are, that no statement is found in O. T. about an answer given to a prophet with respect to such questionings, except to Daniel (Dan. vii. 16), and that in many of the Messianic predictions a remote futurity of fulfilment is so distinctly implied that the seer would not need any further revelation to that effect. This last position is, at the least, open to question, the obviousness to us now, after fulfilment, of indications given in the prophecies themselves of a remote time of realization by no means proving that these evidences could be clearly seen by those to whom the oracles were first given. On the whole, the arguments do not appear adequate to overturn the strong *prima facie* probability that, coming after a detailed account of certain inquiries, the words οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη are to be held as, according to the common use of the aorist, setting forth in historical sequence the answer given by God. That the apostle's statement here is a generalization from the one case of Daniel is not at all a necessary supposition, and does not appear to be a likely one, when we take into view what he says immediately afterwards about the interest felt by the *angels* in Messianic study. There does not seem to be any passage in O. T. on which this latter statement is specially based; and whilst, no doubt, what we are told throughout Scripture of the character and work of the angels leads most naturally to the thought here expressed, yet the apostle presents it with a definiteness suggestive rather of a revelation made to him, or of a remembrance of teaching of the Lord, than of a mere inference. If it be judged that, from their nature, the facts mentioned in this verse were not likely to have been communicated to the apostle by special revelation, there is perhaps nothing forced or fanciful in thinking that both of them may be reminiscences from the discourse which he had heard between Jesus and Moses and Elijah on the

Holy Mount, with respect to "the decease to be accomplished at Jerusalem," or from the converse of the Lord with His disciples after His resurrection (Luke xxiv. 4, 5).

By some interpreters ὅτι after ἀπεκαλύφθη has been taken in the sense of "because, for." Thus Luther translates, "Welchen es geoffenbaret ist. Denn sie haben's nicht ihnen selbst sondern uns dargethan," u.s.w. The bareness and abruptness of οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη, according to this construction, make it an exceedingly unlikely one. Neither is much satisfaction to be found in an attempt which has been made to obviate this objection, by putting the words from ὅτι to αὐτά into a parenthesis, and connecting the following relative clause with ἀπεκαλύφθη,—thus, "to whom were revealed the things which have now been announced to you," etc. The parenthesis is but feebly relevant; the main statement, thus taken, seems to intimate what is inconsistent with all the analogies of God's mode of communication of truth,—that the facts comprised in the N. T. gospel proclamation were made known in clearness and detail to the ancient prophets; and the relative clause, construed in this way, largely loses the force which apparently it is meant to have in the apostle's argument.

The two relative clauses, co-ordinate with each other, with which the verse and the section end, wind up the passage with singular impressiveness,—the statements being eminently fitted to strengthen in the apostle's readers a sense of the glory of the gospel, and of the lively gratitude and firm faith which became them.—*Νῦν* here plainly, in the connection, has a reference of considerable breadth, "in these Christian times," as contrasted with the age of the prophets: thus the aorist, pointing to the first proclamation of the gospel in Asia Minor, stands in the clause with perfect propriety,—cf. Rom. v. 11, vii. 6, xi. 30. This construction of *νῦν* with the aorist, when *νῦν* covers a lengthened period, is found also occasionally in the classics; *e.g.* Plato, *Symp.* 193 A. — In ἀποσταλέντι ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ the apostle by using the aorist seems to point to the great scene at Pentecost; though his words may simply

have regard to the time of the bestowment of the Spirit on each evangelist, the fulness of the phraseology being intended to illustrate the grandeur of this gift.—The basis for appeal for the cultivation of faith and hope is evidently made broad and strong in the words of this little clause: "Those wondrous events to which the prophets looked forward so eagerly are the very events which have been related to you by the gospel messengers; and they have been told to you under the same divine guidance which before was granted to the prophets,—the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the preachers of Christ, indeed, having been manifested with peculiar distinctness and impressiveness." On the object of Peter in this and similar references, full of love and confidence, to the Pauline body of evangelists who carried the glad tidings through Asia Minor, cf. Introduction, § V. 10.

The last clause has great rhetorical beauty and power. "Blest as the holy angels have been since their creation with the beatific vision of God, still they recognise in the Person and work of Christ a new and surpassingly sublime revelation of the divine excellences, into which they long to gaze."—On the anarthrousness of *ἄγγελοι*, see note on *προφῆται*, ver. 10.—*Παρακύπτειν*, properly "to bend aside," commonly "to bend so as to look at," is often in classical Greek "to take a slight side glance;" but in N. T. use the meaning seems unquestionably to be "to look earnestly,"—the exact idea being "to bend so as to see distinctly;" cf. Luke xxiv. 12; John xx. 5, 11; Jas. i. 25. Compare also the use of another compound, *ἐγκύπτειν*, in Clem. Rom. § 40, *ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως*. The thought has been entertained by many expositors, that in the present clause the apostle alludes to the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies, represented as stooping down and looking with affection and reverence toward the Ark of the Covenant covered by the blood-besprinkled Mercy-seat. This supposition is interesting and attractive, but its basis is insecure. It is doubtful whether such was the attitude of the figures; and that the cherubic symbol had any

reference at all to angels is exceedingly questionable; cf. Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture*, Bk. II. chap. 3.

HORTATORY PART OF THE EPISTLE, I. 13–V. 9.

This part subdivides itself into two main sections,—the *first*, extending to ii. 10, containing a somewhat general exhortation to the cultivation of holy character; the *second*, from that point to ver. 9 of the last chapter, giving precepts bearing on particular circumstances and relations.

Vv. 13–16. *Call to hope and to holiness.*

Ver. 13. By διό the apostle reminds his readers of the vital connection between the belief of those central truths of which he has spoken in his first section and Christian affections and conduct. Seeing that the particle introduces a main division of the letter, its reference is naturally taken to be, not specially to the clause or clauses immediately preceding, but to all that has gone before,—"Seeing that God has given to you such exceeding great and precious promises and privileges." From this, two immediate practical inferences plainly are, "You ought to cherish a lively hope of the promised blessedness," and "You ought to seek meetness of character for that blessedness." To both of these the apostle adverts, to the *first* in a single sentence, the echo of which, however, is heard through the whole Epistle; to the *second*, very fully.

First, of *hope*. Two conditions necessary to the maintenance of Christian hope are prefixed by the apostle, in a participial form, to his precept ἐλπίσατε,—the participles themselves, of course, having in their connection practically an imperative force. The sense of the metaphor in ἀναζωσάμενοι κτλ. at once suggests itself, from our knowledge of the long

loose attire of the Orientals, and the need of gathering it up for labour: "preparing yourselves for vigorous and sustained spiritual exertion," "arousing yourselves from your listlessness and dissipation of mental energy." These first words of the verse are quoted by Polycarp (§ 2). — The epexegetical genitive *τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν* is added to *τὰς ὀσφύας* in a free and natural way, bringing fully out the apostle's meaning,— "Do with your minds what is so familiar to you in bodily action, gird up your loins mentally." Cf. the words of Clem. Rom. § 57, in a similar and striking metaphor, *κάμψαντες τὰ γόνατα τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν*. The word *διάνοια* has a special suitableness in the connection, designating particularly as it does the mind as at work in life, in dealing with men and things, ranging "through" all kinds of circumstances and influences, many of them in their nature calculated to weaken or to pervert; cf. Westcott on 1 John v. 20. As to the force of this clause, cf. Luke xii. 35; Eph. vi. 14; and also, if the thought of *παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς* (ver. 1) be judged to have been still in any degree in the minds of the readers, Ex. xii. 11. The compound *ἀναζωννύναι* occurs here only in N. T.; cf. Prov. xxxi. 17, LXX.

From the preparatory work set forth by the aorist participle, the apostle proceeds to exhibit by the present participle *νήφοντες* a constant accompaniment of true Christian hope. The verb *νήφειν*—strictly "to be sober" in the specific sense of the word, "free from intoxication"—is employed in N. T. (*e.g.* 1 Thess. v. 6, 8, and twice elsewhere in our Epistle, iv. 7, v. 8), as occasionally by classical writers, in the wider sense of "to be sober-minded," free from subjection to worldly influences generally. Christian hope can live only with spirituality of thought and feeling and consequent purity of life. In effect, *νήφοντες* sums up the result of the chief part of the mental preparation enjoined in the previous clause; cf. Luke xxi. 34. By some (as Westcott and Hort) *τελείως* is joined to the participle; but it seems more natural to regard the force of this strong word as thrown on

the main verb ἐλπίσατε. The sense given to τελείως in A. E. V., "to the end" (=μέχρι τέλους of Heb. iii. 6, εἰς τέλος of Matt. x. 22), appears to be without analogy; and the ordinary meaning of the adverb, "perfectly," is quite satisfactory, including the other and more, "with full intelligence and intensity and stedfastness."

The force of the combination introduced by ἐπί may be conceived in more than one way. Ἐπί followed by an accusative is joined to ἐλπίζειν only once elsewhere in N. T., 1 Tim. v. 5, where the accusative is Θεόν, and the meaning "to hope in, or on, God." In LXX. this construction is common, the word governed by ἐπί being almost always Κύριον or some pronoun referring to God. On these analogies some scholars take ἐπὶ χάριν also as denoting, not the object, but the basis of the hope, "rest your hope perfectly on the grace—the divine favour—which is being brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." The use of the present participle φερομένην has suggested, moreover, to some that "the revelation of Jesus Christ" here meant is that made in the gospel: "rest your hope on the grace which comes to you from day to day in (through) the revelation of Jesus Christ." This reference of "the revelation," however, is not tenable. The expression ἀποκάλυψις Ἰ.Χ. is a familiar one in N. T. with clear reference to the Second Coming, whereas the other reference here supposed has only one or two remote analogies; and the fact that but a few lines before (ver. 7) the apostle has employed the whole phrase, exactly as here, unquestionably of the Second Coming, seems quite decisive as to his meaning here also. The use of the present participle in a pregnant sense, as including the future, is in this place perfectly natural, and has a peculiar richness of assurance: "which is now on its way to you, and will reach you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." When this, then, is recognised to be the force of the last words of the clause, and we go back to look at χάριν, we feel that with φερομένην it is not naturally taken with its primary force—as "grace," an attribute of God, the *basis* of hope,—but according to its very

common secondary use (*e.g.* ver. 10), as "the gift bestowed by grace," the *object* of hope. Ἐπί with an accusative may manifestly quite as naturally indicate aim as basis; and the analogy of a combination in which the word "God" or "Lord" is that which ἐπί governs, can scarcely with safety be held to determine absolutely what is the sense in a case like the present, where a word of a quite different kind occurs. The closely similar construction ἐλπίζειν εἰς, moreover, is found with both applications; cf. 2 Cor. i. 10; Ecclus. ii. 9. There seems to be sufficient reason therefore for, with the great majority of expositors, regarding the *object* of hope as indicated: "hope perfectly for, set your hope perfectly on." On the various constructions of ἐλπίζειν, see A. Buttmann, p. 175. The χάρις meant is obviously that which was the great subject of the previous section, the final fulness of salvation, the "inheritance" (ver. 4), "salvation" (ver. 5), "praise and glory and honour" (ver. 7). Hope which has this as its object, and which is perfect in purity, in liveliness, and in persistence, is evidently fitted to exert a mighty influence in giving men much of heaven's character and much of heaven's happiness even here.

Ver. 14. The grammatical structure of the passage at this point is not altogether clear. The adversative ἀλλά at the beginning of ver. 15 is so plainly suggested by the immediately preceding clause, and sets the words which follow so sharply in contrast with it, that the course of thought is dislocated to some extent if ἀλλά be made to begin a new sentence. Neither, however, does it seem perfectly satisfactory to have a full break at the end of ver. 13. The absence of a connective particle at the beginning of ver. 14 does not indeed certainly prove, according to our apostle's mode of writing (cf. ver. 22), that he is not here beginning a sentence; yet this, taken in connection with the perfect relevancy of the clauses of ver. 14 when regarded as subordinate to ἐλπίσατε of ver. 13,—expanding in fact νήφοντες,—seems to render it somewhat unnatural to put these verses into distinct sentences.

At the same time, the nature of the clauses of ver. 14 appears to show that the apostle's thoughts are there somewhat more thrown forward on the appeal to holiness than backward on that to hope; and therefore Huther, Westcott and Hort, and others, do begin a new sentence here. On the whole, the view adopted by the Revisers of the E. V., that vv. 13–16 form one sentence, with a slight irregularity of construction in the beginning of the 15th, is perhaps the most likely.

The apostle here glides in an easy and informal way from "Cultivate hope," the first of his practical deductions from that account of the privileges and prospects of believers which he had given in the earlier part of the chapter, into the second, "Cultivate holiness." He begins his exhortation by reminding his readers that through the nature of their position as Christians they were "children of obedience,"—an expression closely corresponding to "elect through consecration of the Spirit unto obedience" (vv. 1, 2). By ὡς this position is set forth as an argument,—this particle, as often (cf. *e.g.* ii. 2, 11, 13), being used ætiologically, "seeing that you are," "as beseems." The genitive ὑπακοῆς may be explained in two ways, the sense yielded being in substance the same, but the aspects a little different. It may be the Hebraistic genitive of quality, practically equivalent to an adjective; cf. Luke xvi. 8, xviii. 6; Jas. i. 25; and see Winer, p. 297; A. Buttmann, p. 161. In this case the meaning is "obedient children (of God)." Seeing, however, that the governing substantive is τέκνα, the combination may be taken as analogous to υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας, τέκνα φωτός (Eph. v. 6, 9), and the like, where, according to a familiar Semitic mode of thinking, "disobedience," "light,"—or whatever it may be,—is set forth as the originating, formative, parental power; cf. particularly Steiger on the present passage, also Ellicott on 1 Thess. v. 5. On this view, the thought immediately presented is not "children *of God* who are obedient," but "persons whose parent is obedience," persons spiritually springing from, having their character determined and moulded

by, obedience. Now the Fatherhood of God to His people has been alluded to early in the Epistle, in "begat us again to an inheritance" (vv. 3, 4), and is expressly introduced again in ver. 17; but in the present sentence the designation "He who called you" is not such as to suggest that in "children of obedience" the writer had sonship to God immediately in his thoughts. Probably, therefore, the second view of the force of the genitive is that which was in his mind. His readers, by their old nature "children of disobedience," were now through the nature of the new life which they had in Christ "children of obedience."

The apostle's exhibition of the character which beseemed "children of obedience" is made first negatively: "not fashioning yourselves (not fashioning your lives in any respect or in any department) in accordance with the desires which you formerly had in your ignorance,"—"*evil* desires, lusts," according to a frequent, perhaps the most common, use of ἐπιθυμία in classical Greek, and certainly its prevailing use in N. T.—With the word μορφή and its derivatives there naturally associates itself a certain idea of permanence, and with σχῆμα and its derivatives one of transitoriness; springing from the fact that μορφή designates the "form" under which the essence of anything reveals itself, whilst σχῆμα, "fashion," indicates rather what is superficial, accidental, variable. The vanity of delight and hope in the life of sin, and the permanence of the joy of holiness, thus explain the change of verb in Rom. xii. 2, from συνσχηματίζεσθε in the first clause to μεταμορφοῦσθε in the second: and similarly we may contrast Peter's use of συνσχηματίζεσθαι here with Paul's longing (Phil. iii. 10) συμμορφίζεσθαι τῷ θανάτῳ Χριστοῦ,—where in the language a sublime paradox presents itself, "to be conformed, linked in character, to Christ's death" implying "to be linked with Christ to glorious immortality." On μορφή and σχῆμα, cf. Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 70, and Bp. Lightfoot's exhaustive and admirable detached note on Phil. ii. 6.

Rigid exactness of construction would have required here with *συνσχηματιζόμενοι* a dative of the *model;* not therefore precisely as it stands, "along with, or similarly to, the lusts," but "similarly to those who live under the power of the lusts,"—that is, specially, in the present case, as the connection suggests, "similarly to the *παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος* in you," "similarly to your own selves while you were still *ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ*." But the free construction chosen by the apostle is perfectly natural, and the meaning obvious. Paul's construction of the same verb in Rom. xii. 2 is also somewhat free, though not quite in the same way.

From the occurrence of *πρότερον* in the clause, *ἐν* in the combination *ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ* seems to be temporal, "in the time of," with also, however, a suggestion of the instrumental force which this preposition so often has in N. T.—Whilst *ἄγνοια*, "(spiritual) ignorance," belongs to all men by nature, yet plainly if we suppose those to whom Peter wrote to have been originally *heathen*, the word has a special fulness of significance; cf. Eph. iv. 18, and see Introd. § II.

Ver. 15. In this verse there is a little irregularity of construction. Having enjoined his readers not to take their old sinful lives as a model to be now imitated by them, the apostle is naturally led to set forth in direct contrast the Supreme Model, and another participial clause might in strictness have been expected, introduced by *ἀλλά*, somewhat thus, *ἀλλὰ συμμορφιζόμενοι τῷ καλέσαντι ὑμᾶς ἁγίῳ*. But, in place of this, his earnestness of appeal leads him most naturally to forget the exact structure of his sentence, and, while presenting the thought of God as His people's Pattern by a slightly different mode of expression, to make his verb a main one in the imperative, instead of a participle. The preposition *κατά* is often in N. T., as by classical writers, used in the sense of "after the model of;" cf. *e.g.* Rom. xv. 5; Eph. iv. 24. In the combination here governed by *κατά* the simplest view of the construction is to regard *τὸν ἅγιον* as going together, "the Holy One," and *καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς*,

"who called you," as inserted, according to an arrangement of words somewhat favoured by the apostle (*e.g.* ver. 14, *ταῖς πρότερον κτλ.*),—instead of *τὸν ἅγιον τὸν ὑμᾶς καλέσαντα.* For a specially close parallel to the present arrangement, cf. 2 Ep. ii. 1. The construction of *ἅγιον* predicatively, as in A. E. V. and text of R. E. V., seems hard and unlikely. Had this been intended, we should probably have had *καθὼς ὁ ὑμᾶς καλέσας ἅγιός ἐστιν,* or something similar.

To the designation of God, "the Holy One," the expression "who called you" is attached with obvious force. Suggesting the thought of duty by their reference to that radical change of moral life to which the readers had been "called," the words add a strong argument in support of the injunction given, by reminding them of the grace which had brought them into that new life. As always in the Epistles, *καλεῖν* used in this way means "to call *effectually*,"—the apostles assuming that the professing Christians to whom they wrote were Christians in truth. In the present place it seems likely, from the quotation appealed to in ver. 16, that the "calling" of Israel into covenant engagements and privileges —which appears to be the basis of the N. T. theological use of *καλεῖν*—was with special vividness before Peter's mind.

The words *καὶ αὐτοί* (cf. ii. 5) set the apostle's readers distinctly face to face with the great divine Model, calling on them, as they contemplate His character, to take that as the standard for their own: "like to the Holy One, be ye yourselves also holy."—*Ἀναστροφή* is a favourite word with our apostle, being used in his writings oftener than in all the rest of N. T. His form of expression here, "*every* *ἀναστροφή*," shows that he is taking the word in the sense of "a *department* of conduct."—*Γενήθητε* illustrates a tendency prevalent in the later Greek, and largely shown in N. T., to use aorists of the passive form in a middle sense; sometimes, as in this case, introducing into common use a previously unused or only provincial passive form, and employing both it and

the older middle form; cf. Winer, p. 327; A. Buttmann, p. 51.

Ver. 16. To the apostle's injunction is in this verse appended, as its ground, a reminder that—as is recorded again and again in Scripture (Lev. xi. 44, xix. 2, xx. 7)—God had given as a fundamental precept to Israel, "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy." *Διότι* always in N. T. (with perhaps the single exception of Acts xx. 26, where, if, as seems likely, this is the true reading, it cannot well but be equivalent to the other reading *διό*), as frequently also in classical writers, has its antecedent involved in it,=*διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι*, *propterea quod*, "because." The *future* form of the injunction, very familiar to us from O. T. usage, is peculiarly impressive,—obedience to Him whose right to reign over all creatures is absolute being assumed rather than expressly commanded, as if nothing else were even conceivable.—The quotation obviously sustains to the full the apostle's precept, *ἅγιοι γενήθητε*; and it suggests also, though it does. not directly state, the standard, "*as* I am holy;" cf. Eph. iv. 24. In its connection here this quotation distinctly shows, too, how fully the apostle regarded the Church of God under all the economies of grace as being *one*, with respect to spiritual relations and obligations.

Vv. 17-21. *Continued exhortation to holiness, and especially to the cherishing of a spirit of holy awe.*

The particular thought with which the section opens was perhaps suggested by *τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς* (ver. 15): "God called you to be His, and ye show recognition of your relations to Him by calling upon Him." The antithesis, however, if such was thought of, is not formally set forth, there being no emphatic *ὑμεῖς* here. The substance of the section is, "Live habitually in fear, remembering your relations to God and His Son Jesus Christ." Taking the precept of ver. 17, *ἐν φόβῳ*

ἀναστράφητε, in association with that of ver. 13, τελείως ἐλπίσατε, we have something of a paradox,—which yet accords with the whole teaching of Scripture and with universal Christian experience,—the fear being that of humility and filial reverence; cf. Phil. ii. 12, iii. 1. "Spei adjungitur timor: utrumque ex eodem fonte: timor prohibet ne spe excidamus" (Bengel).

Ver. 17. *Εἰ*, while, as here used, practically equivalent to "seeing that," has a special power of appeal. It does not formally *assume* the truth of the position stated, on which the following argument is to be based, but calls on the reader to think the whole matter out for himself: "If ye invoke as Father Him who judgeth impartially according to each man's work." We might have expected ὡς before πατέρα, but this is occasionally omitted, particularly where, as here, the predicative word stands in an emphatic position in the clause, the emphasis itself giving the force of ὡς; cf. chap. iii. 15 (correct reading); 1 Thess. v. 8.

One might readily translate by, "If ye call Him Father who judgeth;" but to this there lies the objection that the middle ἐπικαλεῖσθαι nowhere else among the many places where it occurs in the N. T. means simply "call," and, indeed, that its use in this sense by any writer is doubtful. In chap. iii. 6, Peter employs the ordinary mode of expression for "call." Practically in the present place there is exceedingly little difference. In εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε there is possibly a reference to the Lord's Prayer as habitually employed by the believers.

In τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα the apostle, by using the *present* participle, points to a characteristic of the divine procedure at all times, not specifically to the decisions of the great day of final account. The Hebraism πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν (Luke xx. 21; Gal. ii. 6; Lev. xix. 15, LXX.; cf. βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπον, Matt. xxii. 16, Mark xii. 14, and θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον, Jude 16, Job xiii. 10, LXX.) answers to נָשָׂא פָנִים. The expression "to accept a person" is

obviously in itself colourless as regards motive, and in the O. T. it occurs at least as often without as with a bad reference. In the N. T., however, the meaning is always "to have regard as a judge to persons instead of to principles, to be swayed by something in the individual concerned which is irrelevant to the question at issue, to be partial." The compound forms προσωπολήμπτης, προσωπολημψία, προσωπολημπτεῖν, and ἀπροσωπολήμπτως are not found earlier than N. T. The adverb occurs in N. T. only in the present passage, and elsewhere very rarely. Cf. Acts x. 34 (Peter's words), where the sentiment is the same as here, and where alone προσωπολήμπτης occurs. In the passage before us, the specific reference, with respect to impartiality, appears to be to God's not being biassed by any regard to religious profession or privilege, but looking simply to the ἔργον; cf. Rom. ii. 11; Gal. ii. 6.—Ἑκάστου individualizes sharply. Before God no man can become lost in a party, so as to receive acquittal or condemnation simply as a member of the party.—In the singular ἔργον (as Gal. vi. 4) each man's life—the aggregate of the ἔργα (Rom. ii. 6; Rev. xx. 12)—is regarded as one great work, according to the predominating spirit,—a service of God or an opposition to God. Faith, the initial step in the ἔργον of a Christian life, is itself emphatically spoken of by our Lord as τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ (John vi. 29).—Though the relation of a justified man's work to his justification is not precisely analogous to that of an unjustified man's work to his condemnation, yet the expression κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον is in place universally with regard to God's judgement of men, the preposition κατά pointing to the criterion or test. Among the justified themselves, too, the difference in the rewards of grace will be "according to each man's work" (Luke xix. 16–19; 1 Cor. iii. 15).—A probable reminiscence of the clause before us is found in the Epistle of Barnabas, iv. 12, ὁ Κύριος ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρινεῖ τὸν κόσμον· ἕκαστος καθὼς ἐποίησεν κομιεῖται.—In a clause such as the present, where on the one hand the predicative word πατέρα is plainly

emphatic, and on the other hand the mode in which the immediate object of ἐπικαλεῖσθε is expressed brings one particular feature of the divine character and administration into great prominence, it is evident that the argument is intended to rest largely, perhaps equally, on both. "To what kind of life should you be led by consideration of the absolute impartiality of God's judicial dealings, conjoined with remembrance that this impartial Judge is your Father, and is habitually prayed to by you as such?"

Of ἐν φόβῳ . . . ἀναστράφητε, the simple translation, "Live in fear," fails to represent the emphasis given by the position of ἐν φόβῳ: some such rendering as "Let fear mark your life" is required.—The word παροικίας brings up before the minds of Christians a prominent ground of "fear," in the thought of the powerful perverting influence which may be exerted on the citizen of heaven by his alien surroundings during his "sojourn" in this world; cf. ii. 11; Acts vii. 6, 29.

Ver. 18. "Knowing as ye do the divine estimate of the value of a human soul, shown by the price which was paid for your deliverance; and discerning the grounds presented in that price for gratitude and love and holy obedience."—"Not with corruptible things, silver or gold,"—the ordinary means of redeeming from outward slavery or of purchasing any of the good things of this world, but which plainly cannot by possibility furnish any approach to an equivalent, when the question concerns the ransom of an imperishable moral being: on this clause cf. Isa. lii. 3 (οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε, LXX.), which was possibly echoing in the apostle's memory, if not definitely before his thoughts. The derivatives of λύτρον are occasionally and quite naturally used in a somewhat loose secondary sense, simply of deliverance from bondage in a way accordant with right, without the idea of ransom specially presenting itself; cf. Luke i. 68, xxiv. 21; Acts vii. 35. Here, however, quite obviously from the specification of price, λυτροῦσθαι is to be taken with its proper force, "to emancipate by paying a ransom, to redeem;" cf. Tit. ii. 14;

Heb. ix. 12. Compare also the use of *ἀγοράζω*, 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 1; and of its compound *ἐξαγοράζω*, Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5. Redemption is primarily from *curse*, the state of condemnation (Gal. iii. 13); secondly, and as the grand aim, from the thraldom of sinful dispositions and habits, —it being by the atonement rendered consistent with the glory of the divine administration to send forth those influences by which the power of sin is overthrown. This is the aim exhibited here; so in Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 12–14.— The *ἀναστροφή* of men by nature is *ματαία*, "vain, profitless," destitute of good fruits, as regarded from the only worthy point of view, the moral and spiritual: on *μάταιος*, cf. Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 49. The *ἀναστροφή* is described also as *πατροπαράδοτος*, "handed down from ancestors." In connection with *ἀναστροφή*, "life among our fellows," this adjective plainly does not point immediately to the bequest from one generation to another of innate depravity, but to the influence exerted by the issues of depravity, evil training and associations, evil modes of thought and life,—which to so great an extent form a chain binding each new generation, a slavery from which "redemption" is needed.—The non-repetition of the article before *πατροπαραδότου* is in accordance with classical usage in such a case as this, where the substantive already has an adjective; cf. Gal. i. 4, and see Winer, p. 166, with Moulton's note 3; A. Buttmann, p. 91. An adjective or participle thus attached has a prominence which gives it to some extent the force of a distinct predication: cf. Donaldson, *Gr. Gram.* §§ 407 and 489, foll.

Ver. 19. Several translations of this verse are possible, according to the construction given to the genitive *Χριστοῦ*, and according as *ὡς* is taken to be a particle of comparison, thus making *ἀμνοῦ* a mere simile, or to point to function or capacity, in which case *ἀμνοῦ* is a metaphor. Thus we have (1) "with precious blood, as of a lamb unblemished and spotless, namely (the blood) of Christ;" (2) "with the precious blood of—as a lamb unblemished and spotless—

Christ," *i.e.* according to the usual arrangement of words, "of Christ, as a lamb unblemished and spotless;" (3) "with the precious blood of Christ, as *of* a lamb unblemished and spotless" (so A. V.). To the first of these, which is a natural rendering according to the order of words, the objection lies that by it mere blood, one of the *φθαρτά*, and that the blood of one of the lower animals, is—and this manifestly, in the connection, as a ransom for sinners—called *τίμιον*, and seemingly likened in value to the blood of Jesus. The third rendering again is met by the difficulty that a mere simile appears to lack force in a passage of this kind. The second view of the meaning seems to be in all respects suitable. The connection immediately suggests the thought of "a *sacrificial* lamb," from the well-known ritual usages of the Jewish temple, with perhaps a special reference to the paschal service. From John the Baptist's memorable words (John i. 29, 36) the thought of Jesus as "the Lamb of God" must have been very familiar to Peter and to all the others of the first Christians who had been disciples of John, or intimately associated with any of his disciples. Peter's very first acquaintance with Jesus was as "the Lamb of God;" and thus no aspect of the Lord's character and position was likely ever to present itself to the apostle more vividly than this. Assuming the construction to be that which has just been preferred, namely, that *αἵματι* governs *Χριστοῦ*, and the intervening *ὡς ἀμνοῦ* is in apposition to *Χριστοῦ*, the arrangement of words, though not very common, is by no means unexampled. See, for instance, a similar case, also with *ὡς*, in chap. iii. 7, *ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει κτλ.* In such cases the interjected words gain from their unusual position a special prominence, which accords with their argumentative importance. Here, for example, the apposition has the force of "seeing that," accounting for *τιμίῳ* attached to *αἵματι*; and in the connection the particle *ὡς* gives distinctness to this special force (*ὡς*, ætiologia *τοῦ* "pretioso," Bengel). An interesting parallel to Peter's *τιμίῳ αἵματι Χριστοῦ*, possibly a reminiscence, is found in Clem. Rom. § 7, *ἀτε-*

νίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ γνῶμεν ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ.

Ἄμωμος and *ἄσπιλος* are so nearly synonymous, that the employment of the two is in all likelihood simply to set forth the one common thought with special fulness and impressiveness; see, however, Bengel's distinction below. In LXX. usage the word *μῶμος* has passed from its classical sense of "reproach" to a special meaning connected with ritual, "blemish" (ground of reproach and rejection) in an animal presented for sacrifice; and similarly *ἄμωμος* from the sense of "irreproachable" to that of "unblemished." Both words occur in the LXX. frequently, *μῶμος* answering to מוּם, and *ἄμωμος* commonly to תָּמִים; see, for example, Lev. xxii. 19 foll. It is not improbable that this sacrificial use of *μῶμος* may have sprung from the similarity of sound between it and the Hebrew מוּם,—perhaps, indeed, from the one word's having been regarded by the translators as radically the same as the other. Not a few LXX. renderings, some of them much less defensible, seem to have been determined by some such view or feeling; compare *e.g.* *τόκος* (Ps. lv. 12), *τροφή* (Ps. cxi. 5), *ῥάχις* (1 Sam. v. 4) with the correspondent Hebrew. The most interesting case of this kind is the use of *σκηνή* and of the verb *σκηνοῦν* and other derivatives, answering to and apparently intended to have the special force of the Rabbinical שְׁכִינָה; cf. *e.g.* Ps. lxxviii. 60; similarly in N. T., *e.g.* John i. 14; 2 Cor. xii. 9; Rev. vii. 15, xxi. 3. Whether in all the passages of the N. T. where *ἄμωμος* occurs allusion to sacrifice is to be supposed, and the special Hellenistic force attached to the word, or whether in some of them we should give it the wider sense of the classics,—which is found also sometimes in the LXX.,—may be a question; but manifestly in the place before us the thought of sacrifice is present, and thus the meaning of the word is "unblemished." *Ἄσπιλος* does not occur in the LXX., but in the connection *ἄμωμος* at once draws this adjective also into the sacrificial reference; and the stress which, by the employment of the two synonyms, is

given to the one thought of freedom from all defect answers —perhaps intentionally—to the fulness of expression in the Law (Lev. xxii. 21): "It shall be perfect (LXX. ἄμωμον); there shall be no blemish (μῶμος) therein." The thought of the apostle in our passage thus seems to be, "with the blood of Christ as an all-perfect sacrifice." But whilst this is the general thought, the terms ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος also obviously present the special idea—one plainly peculiarly suitable in the course of an appeal to the "followers of the Lamb" (Rev. xiv. 4) to be holy—that one grand element of the perfection of the Lord as the sacrificial victim was His personally "knowing no sin." With respect to the character of the Lord, Bengel thus distinguishes between the two adjectives here employed: ἀμώμου, Jesus Christus in se non habuit labem, —καὶ ἀσπίλου, neque extrinsecus maculam contraxit. Whilst this is ingenious and interesting, and fairly accords with the force of the words, it can hardly be insisted on: at all events, in Eph. v. 27 ἄμωμος and μὴ ἔχουσα σπίλον appear to be used as almost exactly equivalent to each other. Compare also 2 Pet. iii. 14, ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι; ii. 13, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι.

Vv. 20, 21. The statement is here continued of the grounds of that gratitude to God from which springs naturally the holy φόβος of ver. 17. "From eternity, in the purposes of divine love, the Redeemer was destined for you; and you are among those who enjoy the privilege of knowing that He is actually come, and who live under those gracious influences which He bestows."

Ver. 20. As to προεγνωσμένου, see note on πρόγνωσιν in ver. 2. — Πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (John xvii. 24; Eph. i. 4) is—not necessarily, indeed, but, as used in the N. T., actually —equivalent to "from eternity." — In the antithesis, φανερωθέντος might not unreasonably be supposed to mean that Christ (the Mediator who in one Person united the two natures, the Θεάνθρωπος) having from eternity existed as such in the πρόγνωσις of God, "passed from designed into

actual existence." This mode of expression, however, would be singular; and the way in which φανεροῦσθαι is used elsewhere of our Lord's incarnation (1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 John i. 2, iii. 5, 8) suggests rather the bringing in of another thought than that of the πρόγνωσις, namely, a reference to His personal pre-existence in His divine nature. In v. 4 (where see note) the apostle uses φανεροῦσθαι of our Lord's *Second* Coming. — Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων, "in the end of the times (or ages)," *i.e.* specially here, no doubt, the times in the world's history which have been marked off from each other by variety in the modes and measures of God's revelation of His will, times in which are recognised different "dispensations." The previous "times" were all preparatory for the appearance of Christ, and from His advent onwards is "the last time," the consummation or culmination of "the times." Ἐσχάτου is probably neuter, "the end;" cf. Heb. i. 1, also Acts i. 8. — By δι' ὑμᾶς is pointed out the direct practical bearing of the preceding doctrinal statements on the main theme of the sentence, ἐν φόβῳ ἀναστράφητε, εἰδότες ὅτι κτλ. (vv. 17, 18). The words practically repeat the argument set forth in ἐλυτρώθητε (ver. 18), presenting, however, here not merely the fact, but the fact as being the issue of God's gracious purpose. On the last clause cf. a passage in the ancient homily formerly called the Second Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, § 14: ἐφανερώθη δὲ (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς σώσῃ.

Ver. 21. This verse seems designed to gather up the force of the long sentence, showing the perfect relevancy of the reference made in vv. 18–20 to the work of Christ, as an argument in support of the injunction in ver. 17, "If ye call on God as your Father, walk before Him in holy fear." In substance ver. 21 says, "It is only through Christ that you reach this recognition of God as your Father; and thus in connection with this name 'Father' all the tender appeal to the Christian heart, which is made by the remembrance of the advent and sufferings of Christ, naturally presents itself." The

apostle does not, indeed, in our present verse formally refer to the words of the 17th by saying *τοὺς διὰ Χριστοῦ* (or *ἐν Χριστῷ*) *πατέρα ἐπικαλουμένους τὸν Θεόν*, or the like. But the statements, "It is *διὰ Χριστοῦ* that ye are *πιστοὶ εἰς Θεόν*," and "It is through the proof of the acceptance by God of Christ's work which has been given in His raising Him from the dead that you have *πίστιν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἰς Θεόν*," are such as, in the connection of the sentence, are fitted to bring up the other. That Peter intended this verse to recall the first clause of ver. 17, is reasonably inferred from the aptness of his language to do this,—from the compactness of structure which this view gives to the sentence,—and especially from the proof that the Fatherhood of God to believers was still prominently in the writer's mind, which is afforded by *φιλαδελφίαν* in ver. 22, *ἀναγεγεννημένοι κτλ.* in ver. 23, and perhaps *ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη* in ii. 2.

Πιστός followed by *εἰς* (a construction found with the adjective only here in the N. T.) has evidently what is known as its active sense (frequent in N. T.), "believing," = *πίστιν ἔχων εἰς*. *Δι' αὐτοῦ* may be paraphrased by "through the revelation of God given in Christ, and through the influence of the Holy Spirit sent forth by Christ." The thought that faith is "*through* Christ" appears to have been a favourite one with this apostle; cf. his words in Acts iii. 16, *ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ*. — This clause gives some support to the view that the Christians addressed in this Epistle were mainly persons brought out of heathenism. It is true that, taking "faith in God" in a specially deep and rich sense, it may be said of any class of converts that this was reached by them only through their saving knowledge of Christ. But in this passage the language is general, without any express or obvious reference to peculiar liveliness or intelligence or operative power of faith. In such a sentence it seems much less likely that the words are used of Jews, who had from their childhood believed in God, and indeed "made their boast" of Him, than that they are spoken of persons who,

"being in time past Gentiles in the flesh," had in early life been "without God in the world."

The participial clause *τὸν ἐγείραντα κτλ.* is epexegetical of *δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν*. Believing knowledge of Christ produces loving faith in God through the ample evidence presented—especially by our Lord's resurrection—that God loved and honoured Him, and accepted His work for men. — *Καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα* is obviously not a mere feeble addition to the mention of the resurrection, "and therein glorified Him," but carries forward the thought, speaking of the ascension and session at the right hand of the Father; cf. Acts ii. 36 (Peter's words).

If we attach to *ὥστε* in the last clause of the verse its usual meaning, and translate in the way which first suggests itself, "so that your faith and hope are in God," the statement has in some measure the look of a tautology, after *τοὺς πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν*. Some scholars, therefore, have taken the conjunction to be used in the sense of *ἵνα* (so A. E. V.), thus making the *differentia* of the thought as given in this clause to lie in the divine purpose. Words of purpose and words of result have all a tendency to pass into the sphere of each other; and in N. T. there are some unquestionable cases of *ὥστε* as telic; cf. Matt. xxvii. 1; Luke ix. 52. It is to be observed, however, that in these instances the subject of the clause introduced by *ὥστε* is the same as that of the clause to which it is subordinate,—an easier case somewhat for transition from the one sense to the other than that which is before us here, as is now and again illustrated in English by colloquial uses of "so as to." Another possible translation is, "so that your faith is also hope in God." But faith and hope, whilst closely allied to each other, are yet in N. T. regularly distinguished; and the epigrammatic pointedness of expression obtained by this proposed translation belongs rather to modern literary style than to that of ancient writers, and particularly that of Scripture. The position of *ὑμῶν* between the substantives rather favours this predicative construction of

ἐλπίδα,—the ordinary arrangement where nouns which are coupled by καί and have a common article govern a genitive in common being different; cf. *e.g.* Phil. i. 20, 25. But the order in Eph. iii. 5 is as here; and to some extent probably the arrangement was often determined by euphony. On the whole, there does not seem to be sufficient reason for departing from the *prima facie* rendering of the clause, "so that your faith and hope are in God." The apostle appears purposely to refer to his previous words τοὺς πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν, and to intimate simply that the clause τὸν ἐγείραντα κτλ. has explained the genesis of that πίστις,—his "so that" being practically equivalent to, "and thus it is that;" whilst ἐλπίδα is added most naturally, the mention of the glorious proofs of God's having accepted His Son's mediatorial work bringing up vividly before the writer's mind the hope-producing character of Christian faith.

Vv. 22–25. *Exhortation to the cultivation of brotherly love.*

The connection seems to be somewhat of this kind: "Whilst it is true that, so long as you are here, sojourners in the alien world, you have many spiritual perils, such as to make it needful for you to walk in *fear* (ver. 17), bear ever in mind at the same time that even here there is also for you spiritually a home life. As you look on God as your Father in Christ Jesus (ver. 17), remember the many around you who also rejoice in being His spiritual children, and who are thus your brethren. Love them sincerely and ardently. A heart defiled with sin turns ever further towards selfishness; but your hearts are purified through faith to be abodes of love."

Ver. 22. We find occasionally elsewhere in the Epistle a section beginning without a connective particle (as ii. 13); but the present case is the most striking.—The participle ἡγνικότες has its full perfect force—"seeing that, according to your Christian profession, you have from your conversion

onward been purifying." In ἡγνικότες κτλ., as in any clause attached in this way to an ethical injunction, there lies for the conscience a suggestion of command or appeal; but the participle is not to be regarded as having itself a directly imperative force, = ἁγνίσατε . . . καὶ ἀγαπήσατε. This sense of a participle which stands in connection with an imperative—common with the participle of the present and the aorists—is not common, if it occur at all, with the participle of the perfect; and the course of thought set before us by giving to the participle its frequent force of "seeing that" is, to say the least, quite as natural as the other.—Ὑπακοὴ τῆς ἀληθείας, "submission to the truth," an expression obviously of wide range, has here reference most prominently to the primary and fundamental element in such submission, namely, "belief." In and through this spiritual element or atmosphere, πίστις, the purification of the heart takes place: see note on ὑπακοήν, ver. 2, and for an interesting parallel, showing that the thought given in this clause was a favourite one with Peter, see Acts xv. 9.—In εἰς φιλαδελφίαν the telic force of the preposition, while present, is yet not prominent. Εἰς sets forth the natural tendency which the purifying work wrought by faith upon the heart has, a tendency which, of course, becomes a definite conscious aim with the Christian in so far as the matter comes before him in thought.—Whilst καθαρᾶς of T. R., before καρδίας, is no doubt a gloss, it is obviously one supplied with thorough intelligence as to the line of thought, for there is substantially, though not quite exactly, a threefold correspondence of expression between the imperative clause and the participial,—ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε answering to εἰς φιλαδελφίαν, ἐκτενῶς loosely to ἀνυπόκριτον, and ἐκ καρδίας to τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες.

Ver. 23. As to ἀναγεγεννημένοι, see note on ἀναγεννήσας, ver. 3. As the participial clause ἡγνικότες κτλ. led up to the imperative, so here also after the imperative we have another participial clause, setting forth a second most important consideration in support of the appeal, namely,

the sublime and unending nature of that new life through which Christians are brethren.—Of various senses in which classical writers employ the mainly poetical word σπορά (here only in N. T.), the only one which seems to be in this passage perfectly suitable is "seed." The description here answers practically to John's, "Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 13).—The use of distinct prepositions with σπορᾶς and λόγου naturally suggests the thought that the reference of the two substantives is different, ἐκ σπορᾶς designating as the *source* of regeneration the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit. On this view of the meaning we have the sublimity and imperishableness of the new life shown, first, from the fact of its springing from the goodness of the eternal God and His direct action on the soul; and secondly, from the "abiding" energy of the instrument employed. We find, however, that the apostle follows up his mention of the living and abiding character of the λόγος by a somewhat long confirmatory quotation from Scripture, without making any reference whatever to the ἀφθαρσία of the σπορά as something distinct from the ζωή of the λόγος. It is to be observed also that cases occur elsewhere in the N. T. where the prepositions ἐκ and διά are both used in the same sentence and of the same subject, obviously with no substantial difference, but merely showing a different point of view; see Gal. ii. 16; Rom. iii. 30. It appears on the whole, therefore, likely that in σπορά the apostle's thought is not of the influence of the Spirit taken by itself, but of the word as made quickening by His energy, and here regarded as the *spring* of spiritual life; whilst in διὰ λόγου, following as an epexegesis of this, we have the same subject, the word accompanied by divine power, represented as the *instrument* of regeneration. The precise ground of the transition from the one preposition to the other lies, perhaps, among those subtleties of feeling, or subtle discernments of congruity and incongruity, which another mind than the

writer's cannot trace, and which might possibly elude to some extent even his own analysis.

Looking simply at the words by themselves, the expression λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος is ambiguous; and while the order of the words somewhat favours the connection of the participles with λόγου rather than with Θεοῦ (seeing that in the great name, of frequent occurrence, "the living God," ζῶν regularly stands *after* Θεός, see *e.g.* 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 12), still there is here something of peculiarity in the arrangement of words, on either view of the construction. But, taking the connection of the participles to be with λόγου, the course of the argument is more direct and obvious than on the other construction; and the manifest naturalness of supposing a reference in the μένει of τὸ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει in ver. 25 to μένοντος here, which immediately precedes the confirmatory quotation, appears decisive in favour of the connection of "abiding," and of course also "living," with "the word." Some interpreters have cited the words in Dan. vi. 26, 27, Θεὸς ζῶν καὶ μένων, as possibly in Peter's mind, and thus, to a certain extent, favouring the construction of the participles here with Θεοῦ. The supposition of a simple echo in the apostle's mind of the Greek rendering has not much force; because these scholars have not observed that this *order* of the words, which is important in the case, occurs in Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel, usually printed as a part of the LXX., but dating only from the second Christian century.[1] The reading in the true LXX. version is Θεὸς μένων καὶ ζῶν. It is legitimate, however, to suppose that the original Chaldee, with which Theodotion's order accords, may have been in the apostle's thoughts; but assuming that it was, there is nothing of argument here to

[1] With regard to this point, however, an interesting discussion by Professor Salmon of Dublin, at the close of his *Introduction to N. T.*, deserves to be consulted. Dr. Salmon brings forward some evidence tending to show that Theodotion's version of Daniel may have followed the lines of an earlier translation, made, perhaps, before the books of the N. T. were written.

balance the reasons which have been given for joining the participles with λόγου. We are merely led to view the conception as having had in the apostle's mind the form, "the word of God, which liveth and abideth because He liveth and abideth." It is not certain, however, that there is a reference to Daniel at all. It may be that Peter simply attached to λόγου the epithet ζῶντος, which in this figurative use is a favourite with him (cf. ver. 3, and ii. 4, 5), and then, purposing to support his statement by the quotation from Isaiah, out of its μένει took μένοντος. The arrangement of the words favours this view regarding the formation of the expression.

From ver. 25 it is evident that in λόγου the apostle's thought is not merely of the written word, but of God's testimony respecting His Son as given in any form, whether in the types and prophecies of O. T., or in the story of the sufferings and glories of Christ as proclaimed orally by His witnesses and followers.—Considering the assimilative influence with respect to the article which is exerted on λόγου by its construction with Θεοῦ (a word often anarthrous as a proper name), we cannot, on grammatical grounds merely, say with certainty whether λόγου was intended to mean "*a* word" or "*the* word." Looking, however, to the whole structure of the sentence, there appears a probability that the conception of the grandeur of the instrumentality of regeneration was before the apostle's mind in a somewhat general form, and that thus the meaning is best given without the definite article, "through a communication (or testimony) from God, a word living and abiding;" cf. ver. 10, note on προφῆται. On λόγου ζῶντος, cf. Heb. iv. 12.

Dr. Liddon (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 298) maintains (after Didymus and some other Fathers) that by λόγος in this passage is meant the Personal Word. But neither here nor in Jas. i. 21, as to which he holds the same view, does it seem to accord with the context. Looking at the closely connected quotation made by Peter in vv. 24, 25, in which, not λόγος,

but *ῥῆμα* is the word used, and at the practical application made in the beginning of chap. ii., it cannot well be doubted that teaching, oral or written, by God's servants, with regard to His will, is pointed to throughout; and that mystical mingling of the senses, at which Dr. Liddon appears to aim, seems to mar rather than aid his noble argument.

Ver. 24. *Διότι* (on which see note on ver. 16), usually "because," is here and in ii. 6 rather "for," the thought being not of causality but of proof. Meyer, in his note on Rom. i. 19, says that nowhere in N. T. is this conjunction used otherwise than of strict causality; but this remark appears to be too sweeping. These two cases seem to be unquestionably exceptions, though probably the only ones. The apostle's thought here is, "I may most justly apply these epithets to the word of God, for Scripture does the same."—If it be supposed that both parts of the quotation which follows are intended as direct confirmations of the apostle's statements, then the immediate reference of the clause regarding the perishableness of man and man's glory must be to the words *σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς*. The words *οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς*, however, are so obviously secondary in importance in the sentence, being meant merely to lead up and give special impressiveness to the *ἀφθάρτου* which follows, that to suppose a formal Scripture proof of the *φθαρτῆς* by itself is unnatural. We are rather to regard *διότι* as standing logically in connection with *τὸ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει*, the intervening part of the sentence being in thought subordinate. But here, as often, the simplicity of Hebrew and Hellenistic style, instead of marking the subordinate part by an introductory "whilst," "whereas," or the like, in form co-ordinates the thoughts (cf. Rom. iii. 4, vi. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Eph. v. 8).

The quotation from Isa. xl. 6–8 is almost exactly according to LXX. The particle *ὡς* before *χόρτος* is not in LXX., and has nothing corresponding to it in the Hebrew, but through the assimilating influence of the *ὡς* before *ἄνθος*, is most naturally inserted in a quotation made from memory. *Αὐτῆς*,

a more exact rendering of the original, is substituted by the apostle for *ἀνθρώπου*. *Κυρίου*, too, in the last words of the citation, is put in the place of *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, possibly simply through the familiarity of the combination *ῥῆμα* (or *λόγος*) *Κυρίου*,—possibly, however, and not improbably, through definite intention to set forth "the Lord," in the ordinary N. T. sense of that name, as the Author of the "word" spoken of, and thus to lead the way directly to that identification given in ver. 25 of the *ῥῆμα* mentioned by the prophet with the *εὐαγγέλιον* of the New Covenant. The supposition of an intention to bring in this thought accords perfectly with the apostle's teaching, already given in ver. 11, regarding the *Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* as the Instructor of the prophets.—The combination *πᾶσα σάρξ*, designating mankind, specially regarded as frail, occurs very frequently in LXX., and occasionally in N. T. In this favourite Hellenistic construction of *πᾶς* (without the article) with an abstract noun (*e.g.* cf. Eph. i. 8; Jas. i. 2), or here, somewhat similarly, with a collective, "all" may be the best English rendering; but the proper classical sense of this form of expression, "every one," taken separately, seems to be present, though obscured,—"every kind or element of," and here "every member of the race which is described as *σάρξ*, every human being." In the second clause of the present passage, *πᾶσα δόξα* has the idea of "every" prominent, answering as it does in the comparison to *ἄνθος*, not collective, but "*a* flower." As humanity in general answers to the grass, so to the wild flowers among the grass, which specially attract the eye, the "glories" of man answer, those excellences and distinctions of various kinds which show man (the natural man) at his best estate,—"sapientia, robur, opes, justitia humana" (Bengel).

In *ἐξηράνθη* and *ἐξέπεσεν* we have a use of the aorist not uncommon in classical writers, to which some grammarians give the name of "gnomic," as being found especially in condensed general expressions of the results of experience and observation, proverbs, maxims (*γνῶμαι*). In such sentences

what occurs habitually is by the use of the aorist graphically thrown into a narrative form, with regard to a supposed special case. This mode of expression has a peculiar interest and power. In the present place, for example, every reader feels the pathos of the little story, "The grass withered, and the flower fell off." English idiom, however, scarcely permits the use of the past tense in such a sentence, but expresses the habitual occurrence by the present. This use of the aorist is not found very frequently in N. T., the only certain cases of it indeed, perhaps, besides the present, being in the Epistle of James, i. 11, 24,—the former of which passages is plainly based on those same words of Isaiah here quoted by Peter. On the gnomic aorist, A. Buttmann's discussion (*Gram.* p. 201 foll.) is specially full and good.

Ver. 25. The spirit of prophecy being, as the apostle has indicated in ver. 11, testimony regarding Jesus, he proceeds now to declare expressly that the "abiding word of God," of which the passage quoted by him speaks,—the word which abides as a spring of endless life in those who by faith receive it into their souls (this in the present connection being evidently the prominent aspect of the "abiding"),—is to be found in its highest form in the proclamation of Christ's work and grace given in the gospel of the New Covenant.—On the transition from the word λόγος (ver. 23) to ῥῆμα here, it is perhaps worth while to call attention—as possibly illustrating a habit of expression—to an exact parallel in Acts x. 36, 37 (Peter's words).—Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in the middle voice is construed in N. T. with an accusative, either of the truth made known (*e.g.* Eph. iii. 8), or of the persons to whom it is made known (Luke iii. 18). In the passive, accordingly, either of these may be the subject: for the present construction, cf. Gal. i. 11; and for the personal, Luke vii. 22.—For εἰς ὑμᾶς (in place of the more usual ὑμῖν) εὐαγγελισθέν, cf. Heb. ii. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 9. The difference in meaning is slight, and the choice between the forms of expression may possibly have been determined sometimes by a feeling of rhythm. Instead of setting forth

immediateness of communication and personal privilege, as the dative would, the construction with εἰς intimates that the glad tidings were sent "among, into the midst of," the persons addressed. The use of the word εὐαγγελισθέν here may possibly show that the passage of Isaiah following that which the apostle has quoted was chiming in his memory, seeing that the expressions ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Σιών and ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Ἱερουσαλήμ occur in the next verse, and that the main thought in that verse, and the paragraph which it introduces, is of the gospel proclamation: "Say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God," etc.

CHAPTER II.

Vv. 1–3. *Exhortation to seek fuller spiritual acquaintance with divine truth, the nourishment of the new life.*

THERE being everywhere mutual influence, action and reaction, among the spiritual powers and graces, as among the energies of the natural life, the apostle, having in the previous paragraph called on his readers, as "purified through obedience to the truth, regenerated through the word of God" (i. 22, 23), to cultivate brotherly love, appeals to them in the present passage to increase in spiritual acquaintance with the truth, and in view of this to remember that only in the atmosphere of love can there be growth in spiritual wisdom. Taking the two paragraphs together, the apostle's position is this, that in men to whom divine truth has become the seed of spiritual life, it shows its heavenly nature by producing love; and again, only through love can the new life increase in strength, because only where love reigns can there be true growth in spiritual knowledge of God's teaching. From the enumeration given of offences against brotherly love, the apostle's thought seems to be immediately and specially of the impossibility, where such offences are committed, of any progress being made in the acquisition of Christian wisdom through the *social ordinances* of the Church; cf. Jas. i. 19–21.

Ver. 1. The figure underlying the ethical use of *ἀποτίθεσθαι*, common in N. T., may be the putting off of garments; cf. Acts vii. 58.—***Κακίαν***, in its connection, is most naturally taken here, not in its widest sense, "wickedness," but with the narrower reference which it often has, "ill-will." Then, introduced by

καί, as often, species are put under the genus *κακία*. These species are two states of heart, deceitfulness and envy, each with its characteristic in outward conduct, "hypocrisies" and "calumnies." The earnestness of the writer, and his sense of the importance of his injunction, are seen in his plurals, "hypocrisy, envy, calumny, in every form," and his repeated "all." On this use of *πᾶς*, see i. 24, note.

Ver. 2. *Ὡς* is not to be taken here as a particle of comparison, "as if ye were new-born babes," or, "as new-born babes do." To take it as marking a ground of appeal is more natural, and gives the sentence more terseness and vigour,—"as beseems (*i.e.* seeing that this beseems) new-born babes." The apostle thus, without interposing an explanation, simply carries on his figure from *ἀναγεγεννημένοι ἐκ σπορᾶς ἀφθάρτου* (i. 23). No explanation is needed, for vv. 24, 25 merely illustrate the statement that regeneration is *διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος*, and the figure of the new birth remains vividly before the mind of the reader. This ætiological use of *ὡς* is a favourite one with Peter; *e.g.* cf. i. 14, 19, ii. 11, iii. 7.—In *ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη* we are hardly to recognise an intimation that those to whom the apostle wrote had but very recently been converted to Christianity. It is probable that with many of them this was not the case, because, on any likely view of the date of this Epistle, many years had elapsed since Paul's first visit to those parts. Be this as it may, however, nothing in the context suggests this particular thought; and the fact that the precept given is one applicable to all believers in all stages of their Christian life while on earth, leads rather to the belief that what was present to the apostle's mind was the infantile measure of attainment of God's children here below, even the most mature, when compared with the glory of their manhood in heaven. If the meaning be thus general, then, of course, also the word "milk" does not here—as in 1 Cor. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12, 13—designate specifically the mere elements of revealed truth, in contrast with what is more abstruse. To the teach-

ing of heaven, the very highest which we have here is doubtless but as the nourishment of infants.

The epithet ἄδολον — here only in N. T. — "unadulterated, pure," may contrast the genuine teaching of God with corrupted forms of teaching claiming to be from Him (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 2). Nothing in the context, however, suggesting this thought, it is more likely that the reference is general,— to the absolute purity of God's teaching, in contrast with all human speculations on religion, in which—even the wisest and best—something of what is impure and injurious always mingles. On ἄδολον, "unadulterated," cf. a combination in Philo (*Mund. Opif.*, Mang. p. 33), ἀμιγῆ καὶ ἄδολον καὶ καθαράν. The expression γάλα ἄδολον is in current use in modern Greek for milk unadulterated with water or other ingredients. As to the precise force of the word, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 56. —Considering the close connection of the present paragraph with the preceding, the idea which A. E. V. adopts ("milk of the word") is quite a natural one,—that by the adjective λογικόν the apostle expressly indicates the λόγος Θεοῦ ζῶν καὶ μένων, of which he had just spoken, to be the ἄδολον γάλα. But whilst the reference in γάλα is really precisely what is thus set forth, no analogy in the use of λογικός, or of any adjective of its form, in the least degree favours the view that the word is intended to state this; and indeed it is certain that to a Greek reader such an application of it must have appeared utterly forced. This adjective occurs in N. T. elsewhere only in Rom. xii. 1, where, in exact accordance with the ordinary use of the word by classical writers, the meaning plainly is "rational, suited to a being endowed with reason." This sense is perfectly in place here also. The word seems intended mainly to mark clearly the figurative application of γάλα, in the same way as in i. 13 τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν is added to ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας. The apostle's thought at the moment, as it would seem, being simply of the distinction between the material and the thinking elements in man, the more common N. T. word πνευματικός

might appear, from the ordinary N. T. application of *πνεῦμα* and its derivatives, somewhat too specific for his purpose; whilst *ψυχικός* again in N. T. use tends towards an evil sense. —The use of the passive of the verb *αὐξάνω* in the general sense of "to grow" is so common (cf. in N. T. Matt. xiii. 32) that we have hardly a right to take *αὐξηθῆτε* here with a strict passive force, and thus recognise an intended reference to the great Divine Agent in spiritual growth (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7). —In *σωτηρίαν*, as here used, the prominent idea is plainly spirituality, perfect conformity to the will of God; cf. Phil. i. 19, ii. 12.

Ver. 3. ***Εἰ*** here has the same force as in i. 17 and often: "this is a part of the question which I leave you to think out for yourselves, but observe that *if* the case is so, then the precept given will be felt by you to be most reasonable." The child of God, from the very nature of the new life, longs always for further spiritual nourishment, and feels that he ought to have for it similar intensity and singleness of longing to that of the infant for its natural food.—The fact that of the familiar words in Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii. Sept.) 8, on which this verse is plainly based, *καὶ ἴδετε* have nothing here corresponding to them, seems to show that *ἐγεύσασθε* is meant to stand out in thought,—and is not to be translated according to its secondary sense, "experience," but to have the figure which lies in it fully exhibited, in continuation of the image in ver. 2. But to find in *χρηστός* also that particular sense of "good" in which we apply this word to food, meaning "sweet, pleasant to the palate, and wholesome" (cf. Luke v. 39), is certainly forced. Applicable, of course, to *γάλα*, this sense of the adjective is quite unsuited to the actual connection, as predicate to ***Κύριος***. The word bears here the same meaning which it has in the psalm, and regularly when used of God, "good" in the sense of "kind."—In transferring from the psalm the name ***Κύριος***, the apostle employs it with its usual N. T. application to the Lord Jesus. This could hardly be gathered simply from this verse itself, but is clearly shown

by the 4th, which is introduced by ὅν, referring to Κύριος, and which quite plainly speaks of Christ. We have here therefore one of the many cases in N. T. in which the apostles freely apply to the Saviour O. T. language employed of Jehovah, and thus most unequivocally—and with an impressiveness peculiarly great, from the very indirectness of the testimony—indicate their belief in Christ's divinity.

Vv. 4–6. *Believers are a spiritual temple and a holy priesthood.*

This section may be taken either as an exhortation or as a description of privilege,—"Be built," or "Ye are built;" and there seems nothing to show decisively which of the two was immediately the apostle's thought. The preceding section is hortatory, that which follows descriptive; and the verses before us attach themselves readily enough to either of these sections. On the whole, from the cast of thought and the nature of the imagery, it appears most natural to regard οἰκοδομεῖσθε as indicative, the passage being intended to illustrate by other figures what has been meant by αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν of ver. 2. At the same time, as with every description of the spiritual privileges of believers, the section is practically hortatory to the Christian heart.

Ver. 4. The expression "to come to Christ" may obviously refer to the initial spiritual act, and often does so, *e.g.* John vi. 35. The compound προσέρχεσθαι, however, seems usually to point rather to the habitual resort of the already renewed man to the Source of blessing, *e.g.* Heb. x. 1, 22. Such is evidently the meaning here, from the fact that not the aorist participle, but the present, is used. The construction of προσέρχεσθαι elsewhere in the N. T. is with a dative; but nothing appreciably different in meaning seems to be intended here by the repetition of the preposition; cf. Winer, pp. 266, 539.—The contrast which we have here, between God's estimate and treatment of Christ and man's, was a favourite

thought with the Apostle Peter (Acts ii. 22–24, iii. 13–15), and on one notable occasion was set forth by him under the same image as here, and by quoting one of the O. T. passages here referred to (see Acts iv. 11). It is not unnatural to suppose that the signification of the name which had been given by the Lord to the apostle himself made this particular figure specially interesting to him; and as we see into what prominence he puts the one divine Living Stone, and how entirely secondary and dependent he evidently considers his own standing and office as a *πέτρος* to be, one cannot but contrast apostolic Christianity and mediæval superstition.

To *λίθον* Peter attaches his favourite epithet *ζῶντα* (i. 3, 23), to which when applied to Christ all Scripture analogies—as John vi. 51; Rev. i. 18—teach us to give a pregnant sense, "possessed of a sublime and diffusive fulness of life," practically equivalent to *ζῶντα καὶ ζωοποιοῦντα*, according to the principle explicitly stated in John xiv. 19. By the anarthrous structure of which he is fond (cf. i. 10, note on *προφῆται*),—through which the thought is set before the reader as one with which he is not assumed to be already familiar,—the apostle with special force calls on us to ponder the unique features of the picture—"a stone living and life-giving."—By the next words it is shown that, in employing the metaphor of the stone, the apostle had an O. T. use of that figure distinctly before his mind. Two verses which are quoted a little farther on—Ps. cxviii. 22, quoted in ver. 7, and Isa. xxviii. 16, quoted in ver. 6—are both plainly referred to in this verse also. The 118th Psalm appears to have been written in connection with the building of the second temple. The primary reference of its 22nd verse seems to be, under an image suggested by the circumstances, to the restoration of Israel to their own land, and to something of freedom for national action; whilst their foes, who reckoned themselves to be the prime movers or builders of the world's greatness and power, had judged the nation to be for ever put down, and worthy only of contempt. This is the first reference. But

Israel, the elect nation (Isa. xlv. 4), kingly and priestly (Ex. xix. 6), God's son, even His first-born (Ex. iv. 22), was to some extent typical of Messiah, the elect King and Priest, God's Only-begotten; see Matt. ii. 15, compared with Hos. xi. 1. Foreshadowings of the Messiah in Ps. cxviii. were, it would seem, widely recognised among the Jews, for at the Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem the joyful utterances of the people were taken from it (Matt. xxi. 9; Ps. cxviii. 25, 26). The 22nd verse, that referred to in the place before us, and more fully in ver. 7, had been cited by the Lord Jesus, and applied to Himself, in circumstances of peculiar interest, which evidently impressed the disciples very deeply, so that the fact of His having then quoted the words appears to have entered into the general oral apostolic account of His life (mention of it being found in all three synoptic Gospels, Matt. xxi. 42; Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 17).

Considering that one main object of this Epistle was plainly to guide and encourage Christians tried and depressed by persecution, it seems natural to regard the apostle's thought, in what he says here of the stone, as being somewhat to this effect, "Be not perplexed or led astray by the fact that many around you, who hear of the Lord Jesus,—including persons whom, from their social position, or their abilities and acquirements, you might naturally think of as leaders,—reject His claims, and, it may be, cause you to suffer for your adherence to His name. Remember that God honours and delights in Him. Think of His rejection and crucifixion by the Jewish Sanhedrin, and of His resurrection and exaltation by the hand of God. The same contrast of judgement respecting Him reigns all down the ages; hatred by man, love and care by God, for His cause and people. Mysterious, too, as the world's antagonism to Him and His may seem to you to be, bear in mind that this is simply what Scripture should have led you to anticipate; for the very same prophecies which tell of the divine choice of Messiah, tell also of His being despised and rejected by men." Such being the apostle's

line of thought, he is led to substitute for "the builders" of Ps. cxviii. 22, the general word "men,"—an intimation that the spirit of the Sanhedrin who condemned Jesus, is the spirit of the natural man universally. This same thought—that the rejection of the Lord by the Jewish leaders was not simply an historical event standing isolated, but was the most notable exhibition of a spirit which has been shown by multitudes every day since—seems to lie in the perfect participle *ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον*, chosen by the apostle in place of the aorist *ἀποδοκιμασθέντα*, which is the form naturally suggesting itself first to one who would turn the LXX. expression *ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν* (as in ver. 7 below) into a passive participle.

Whilst Ps. cxviii. 22 presents at its close the issue and evidence of the divine judgement respecting Christ, in the stone's "becoming the head of the corner," the apostle prefers here to give a still more exact antithesis to *ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον*, by setting forth the divine judgement itself,—quoting a word or two from Isa. xxviii. 16, a verse in which Messiah is spoken of under the same figure.—The use of *παρά* with the dative in the sense of "in the sight of, in the judgement of," common in the N. T., is also quite classical.—The verbal adjective *ἐκλεκτόν*, standing as it does in clear and direct antithesis to *ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον*, has plainly its usual participial force of "chosen." At the same time, however, in its connection here not, as often, with a possessive genitive, but with *παρά*, the reference to quality, excellence, which it frequently has—answering to the English adjective "choice"—is also prominently suggested.

Ver. 5. Though the fact that the stone spoken of was for a *foundation* has not been expressly mentioned, it has been directly suggested by the well-known substance of the O. T. passages referred to. That this would be quite understood has indeed been assumed by the apostle in his employment of the words "rejected" and "elect," which evidently point to a question of suitableness for some definite and important purpose. In the clause to which we now come, we again find

this assumed, because *καὶ αὐτοί* does not very naturally, according to the structure of the passage, attach itself only to *ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες*, putting these words in express association with the *λίθος ζῶν* of the previous verse, but also to *οἰκοδομεῖσθε*, putting the building in of these *λίθοι ζῶντες* in express association with the implied laying of that one stone as the foundation of a building: "As Christ the Living Stone has been built in as part of the temple, so ye believers also as living stones are being built in." There is already fully before Peter's mind the sublime vision of a living temple. In place of the material edifice at Jerusalem,—to the grandeur of which, and the magnitude of the separate stones, it was very probably this apostle who, on one occasion, called the attention of the Lord (Mark xiii. 1),—he sees the Church of Christ as "a spiritual house," a house built up of immortal souls, all illuminated and quickened through the power of the Divine Spirit, and filled with the glory of Jehovah. This same image, it will be remembered, was already familiar to many of those Asiatic Christians to whom Peter's letter was addressed, from its being found in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (ii. 20–22). In his writings Paul commonly (1 Tim. iii. 15 being exceptional) employs for the Church as God's temple the name *ναός*, a term fitted particularly to produce solemnity of thought,—"a dwelling of the Almighty, and scene of divine worship,"—while Peter (cf. iv. 17) loves rather *οἶκος*, in which the endearing aspect of the image is specially prominent—"the abode of a Father." In a passage in the Epistle of Barnabas (§ 16), which on the whole sounds like an echo of the present, *ναός* is used: *πνευματικὸς ναὸς οἰκοδομούμενος τῷ Κυρίῳ.*

Ὡς before *λίθοι ζῶντες* means "as befits:" thus, according to the figure here, where the temple is the Church, each stone is conceived of as having life through Christ before being built in. Where the individual Christian is thought of as a sanctuary (as in 1 Cor. vi. 19), the living temple is conceived of as being such simply through its resting on the living founda-

tion, which sends life through the whole. — The proleptic predicative combination *οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικός* is a case of a natural and frequent kind of development from the construction of verbs of being and becoming (= *οἰκοδομούμενοι*, or *διὰ τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι, οἶκος πνευματικὸς γίγνεσθε*), closely analogous to a common use of *τίθεσθαι* (*e.g.* 2 Tim. i. 11; Heb. x. 13).

To the literary law which requires strict unity in imagery, the style of the sacred writers, particularly of the O. T. writers, has little regard. Provided that an impressive presentation of truth is secured, there is no fastidious shrinking from the mixing of metaphors. In the verse before us, however, we have not, strictly speaking, a mixed metaphor, but rather simply a rapid transition from one figure to another, each adequately and harmoniously outlined. Something like the following may have been the apostle's course of thought. The temple naturally suggests a priesthood; and the statement "to whom coming, ye are built up a spiritual house,"—which, as has been seen, appears to be an expansion of the thought "grow unto salvation" of ver. 2, — contains and suggests prominently to every Christian reader the general idea, "Ye are brought more and more fully under the influences of the Holy Ghost." To this here attaches itself, as the statement of the divine purpose in this gracious dealing, "for a holy priesthood." Like "priesthood" in English, *ἱεράτευμα* is used either of office or in a collective sense; and in the present passage either of these would suit the connection,—(1) "for holy priestly position and functions," explained by the infinitive clause following, which in this case would be a clause of apposition; or (2) "for (= *εἰς τὸ εἶναι*) a body of holy priests," in which case *ἀνενέγκαι* is an infinitive of purpose. The unquestionably collective use of *ἱεράτευμα* in ver. 9 strongly favours our here also giving the word this sense,—which in itself, moreover, seems somewhat the more natural. Taking *ἱεράτευμα* in this sense, the construction with *εἰς* appears, according to familiar

Hebraisms, to suggest as having been the immediately preceding thought in the apostle's mind either "becoming" (as in ver. 7) or "God appointing you" (as in Acts xiii. 22).

The use of *ἀναφέρειν* for the offering of sacrifices, sometimes with the reference to the altar expressed (as Jas. ii. 21), sometimes omitted (as Heb. vii. 27), is common in the Hellenistic writers. This application of the word does not seem to be found in classical authors, but is obviously in itself quite natural. — Forms both from *ἤνεγκα* and *ἤνεγκον*, simple and in composition, are used in N. T., but in the *infinitive* the *second* aorist form prevails, *ἀνενέγκαι* here being, according to the best texts, the only exception; cf. A. Buttmann, p. 68. — With regard to the "spiritual sacrifices" offered by believers, cf. Rom. xii. 1; Phil. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 15, 16.—Whether in the mind of the writer the words *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* were connected immediately with *εὐπροσδέκτους Θεῷ* or with *ἀνενέγκαι* is not clear; but the point is of little moment, because either statement really implies the other also. Looking at the position of the words, and considering that the previous statements respecting the need of habitual "coming to Christ," and respecting being built as living stones on Him, the Living Foundation, sufficiently in themselves suggest, when we pass to the new figure, that only in Him believers have their position as priests, it seems probable that the immediate connection of "through Jesus Christ" here is rather with "acceptable." On the acceptance of the offerings to God presented by the priestly nation of Israel through the mediation of their high priest, cf. Ex. xxviii. 38.

Ver. 6. *Διότι* here is not strictly causal, but introduces *evidence* from Scripture; cf. i. 24. Proof is given of both of the statements which have been made, that respecting the glorious position of Christ in the sight of God, as a Living Stone elect and precious, and that respecting the honoured standing before God of Christ's people. Ample attestation of both is given simply by quoting in full that

passage of Isaiah from which the description of Christ in the 4th verse, as ἐκλεκτός, ἔντιμος, has been taken.—The verb περιέχειν, properly transitive, "to contain" (as in Acts xxiii. 25), is here used peculiarly. Either some such subject as ἡ περιοχή or ὁ τόπος, "the passage," must be understood, with the quoted words construed as object, or the verb must be regarded as employed semi-impersonally, "it runs thus." From the frequent intransitive and impersonal use of ἔχειν and its compounds, the latter seems to be the preferable explanation; and this is sustained by a similar use of περιέχει in Josephus (*Antiq.* xi. 4. 7), βούλομαι γενέσθαι πάντα καθὼς ἐν αὐτῇ (Κύρου ἐπιστολῇ) περιέχει. With this varied use of περιέχει may be compared the somewhat similar use in English of the word "read,"—"How do you *read* the passage?" "The passage *reads* thus." A certain difficulty in the construction of περιέχει seems to have been felt by some ancient transcribers, for a reading which is found in a few early authorities, ἡ γραφή in place of ἐν γραφῇ, is in all likelihood an attempt to simplify.—Ἐν γραφῇ means "in a Scripture" (*i.e.* passage of Scripture),—or perhaps, taking the noun as collective, "in Scripture." Bp. Lightfoot (on Gal. iii. 22) maintains that the singular γραφή always in N. T. means a particular passage of Scripture. That this is the general use there is no doubt; but to take Acts viii. 32, Gal. iii. 22, and especially 2 Pet. i. 20, in this way, seems forced.

The apostle quotes the passage Isa. xxviii. 16 very nearly as it is rendered (in substantial accordance with the Hebrew) by LXX., substituting, however, a somewhat more simple and exact translation of the first word or two, omitting one of the epithets applied to the stone, and in the last clause adding the words ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Portions of this same verse are quoted in Rom. ix. 33, x. 11, and two of the divergences from LXX., which are found here, occur there also, namely the substitution of τίθημι ἐν Σιών for ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών, and the addition of ἐπ' αὐτῷ. These common divergences, however, hardly establish a likelihood

that Paul's use of the passage was in Peter's mind, because there is not identity of form throughout, Paul giving the last clause somewhat differently from LXX., with which Peter agrees; whilst, as regards *τίθημι ἐν*, it has to be said that this is the most obvious and natural rendering of the Hebrew, such as might readily occur to the apostles separately. The fact that the words *ἐπ' αὐτῷ* are added in all the three quotations of the last clause of the verse which are made in the N. T., seems to show either that in the days of the apostles this addition was read in LXX., or that the passage had come to be usually filled up in this way when cited in apostolic teaching. To the former view support is given by the fact that these words are found in the text of LXX. as given in Codex B, whilst Codex A has the variation *ἐν αὐτῷ*. Supposing the words to have been in LXX., it is likely that the translators meant by them "on *it*" (*τῷ λίθῳ*). If, on the other hand, they constituted an apostolic supplement, then the thought intended is more naturally taken to be directly personal, "on *Him*." Indeed, whatever was the origin of these supplementary words, the way in which the Apostle Paul quotes the clause by itself in Rom. x. 11 suggests that he at least was thinking not of "*it*," the image, but of "*Him*," the reality. — *Λίθος ἀκρογωνιαῖος*, "a stone for the point or extremity of the corner," elsewhere described (see ver. 7) as *κεφαλὴ γωνίας*, seems clearly, from the structure of the figure in the passages where the terms occur, to designate not the copestone, as some have supposed, but the great stone which was laid for the foundation at the place where two walls met, and was consequently reckoned the chief stone (*κεφαλή*), being of peculiar importance with regard to the stability of the building. The expression *εἰς τὰ θεμέλια* of the LXX. rendering in Isa. xxviii. 16 shows decisively that the Alexandrian translators at least had no doubt about the *λίθος ἀκρογωνιαῖος* being a foundation-stone. —The precise meaning of the last words of the verse in the original Hebrew is "shall not make haste;" but this is

substantially equivalent to οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ of LXX., which is here adopted by the apostle; for the "haste" spoken of is evidently flight in consequence of the proved insecurity of a support which had been trusted in.

Vv. 7–10. *The glory of the position of privilege enjoyed by Christians.*

The apostle, starting with an application of the closing words of that quotation from Isaiah which has been made in ver. 6, confirms the faith of his readers by pointing out the dignity of their position,—the impressive contrast presented by the position of unbelievers being also touched upon, in natural accordance with that antithesis between God's judgement of Christ and the world's, to which he had adverted a little before (ver. 4).

Ver. 7. The meaning of the first clause, paraphrased, is: "According to the last words of the prophecy just quoted, then, you observe, it is for your good—who are believers—that the preciousness or value serves which belongs to the stone, and which has been expressly ascribed to it by the epithet ἔντιμος."

Another view of the force of ὑμῖν than that which has been followed in this paraphrase is grammatically possible. The dative may be taken (so R. E. V. marg.) as one, not of advantage, but of opinion (see Acts vii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 23, 24; and cf. Winer, p. 265), "in your judgement or sight." To this view there are very strong objections. (1) If it be accepted, the rest of the clause cannot be quite satisfactorily construed. The meaning yielded is, "It is then in the judgement of you believers that the stone is ἔντιμος." This is obtained in one of two ways. To ἡ τιμή may be supplied τῷ λίθῳ ἐστίν; but such a supplement is plainly very hard and unlikely. Or ἡ τιμή may be regarded as not subject but predicate, and equivalent to ἔντιμος, the subject being "the

stone," or, personally, "Christ:" so A. E. V. This also is a mode of construction so forced, that nothing but absolute inability to bring out a satisfactory meaning in any other way could justify resort to it. (2) The whole section—vv. 7–10—seems undoubtedly to constitute a unity. Ὑμεῖς δέ of ver. 9 is in sharp antithesis to ἀπιστοῦσιν of ver. 7; which again is in as direct and manifest antithesis to ὑμῖν at the beginning of that verse. Now quite indisputably vv. 9, 10 describe objective results of Christian faith, in the dignities which God confers on believers. We naturally assume then that the contrasted passage introduced by ἀπιστοῦσιν is similarly objective; and this the structure of that passage accords with, and its substance requires, for, as a matter of fact, the Stone is not in the judgement of unbelievers the head of the corner. That clause again being antithetical to the first, which is now under consideration, there appears an utter want of naturalness in taking this as other than also objective. On these grounds it may safely be held that the force of the clause is that which has been given in the paraphrase above. The immediate reference of οὖν—practically answering here very nearly to our English "you see"—is to the last clause of the prediction quoted in ver. 6, in which it was said that "the believers in Christ shall assuredly not be put to shame." This security of believers is then thought of by the apostle in its connection with that τιμή which in the epithet ἔντιμος had been ascribed to the Stone.—As to the use of the article in ἡ τιμή to exhibit a definiteness connected with the amplification of a thought contained in a previous word, cf. *e.g.* Acts vii. 41, τῷ εἰδώλῳ, where the article refers to ἐμοσχοποίησαν; Matt. i. 24, τοῦ ὕπνου, referring to κατ' ὄναρ. The present case is even simpler than these, through the fact that the same root is found in both words.

With respect to the precise sense to be attached to τιμή and ἔντιμος in this passage, there is some doubt. Classical usage favours "honour" and "held in honour." In LXX.,

however, the other shade of the meaning of the words of this root, "value," is abundantly prominent, as they are used to represent the Hebrew יָקָר, "to be precious," and its cognates; and in particular this is the case with ἔντιμος in the very passage of Isaiah quoted in ver. 6. This makes it at least extremely probable that "value" was the thought in Peter's mind. In the exegesis of the first clause of ver. 7, too, it seems as if the idea of "value"—that value through which actually the security spoken of in the previous clause, and referred to in this clause by οὖν, was obtained—more naturally presents itself than "recognition of value, honour." "Precious" and "preciousness" seem therefore, on the whole, the preferable renderings. If, however, "honour" be taken to be the shade of meaning intended, the sense of ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμή would appear to be, "To you then, you observe, from the promise that believers shall not be put to shame—to you, as living stones built upon the living foundation—the honour which belongs and is in the prophecy ascribed to the foundation, is in a measure extended,"—there being thus a reference to the participation by Christians in the glory of their Lord, according to His declaration (John xvii. 22). Whether this great thought—relevant in the connection undoubtedly, but not in any express way led up to in the context—would naturally have been presented in so very contracted and obscure a form as that in which the words of this clause would give it, may be doubted.—By τοῖς πιστεύουσιν the apostle recalls attention to ὁ πιστεύων in the last clause of the prediction just cited from Isaiah, and thus to the condition, as regards state of soul, which, in using the word of direct address, ὑμῖν, he has assumed to be complied with by his readers. The position of this participial adjunct, at the end of the clause, separated from ὑμῖν by several words, gives it a strong emphasis, and adds also to the effect of the antithesis with ἀπιστοῦσιν, the immediately following word.

Throughout the rest of this section, while not formally making a quotation, as he did in ver. 6, the apostle clothes

his thoughts to a great extent in O. T. forms of expression. First, continuing the figure of the stone, he cites in full Ps. cxviii. 22, already referred to in ver. 4. The citation is precisely in the words of LXX., except that, according to the most ancient authorities for the text, the regular construction by the nominative λίθος is substituted for the slightly irregular λίθον of LXX. As to the original reference of Ps. cxviii. as a whole, and of this verse in particular, see notes on ver. 4; as to κεφαλὴ γωνίας, note on ἀκρογωνιαῖον in ver. 6. As to the construction εἶναι or γίγνεσθαι εἴς τι,—on the whole a Hebraism, though with classical precedent for a certain sphere of its use,—cf. Winer, p. 229, and especially A. Buttmann, p. 150.—Οὗτος, in its familiar redundant use to gather up the subject and bring it into immediate connection with the predicate, has obviously here a decided emphasis, "that very stone."

Ver. 8. Seeing that ἀπιστοῦσιν has so emphatic a position at the beginning of this part of the sentence, obviously as a dative of disadvantage, it is thus, of course, implied that the statement regarding the stone's having become the chief stone of the corner was at the moment standing out before the apostle's mind in its relation particularly to *unbelievers*, as involving for them—all unbelievers having been represented by the builders—the disgrace of folly and failure. In ver. 8 he carries this thought forward, exhibiting the stone as being to the unbeliever, through its advancement to the headship of the corner, an instrument of loss and punishment. This he expresses in words of Isaiah (viii. 14), not quoting LXX., but translating more exactly. Paul translates in the same way in Rom. ix. 33, incorporating the words with portions of Isa. xxviii. 16.—Between the sense of λίθος προσκόμματος and πέτρα σκανδάλου there seems to be no appreciable difference, the doubling of the expression being simply for solemn emphasis.—The "stumbling" here spoken of is not intellectual difficulty found in the way of accepting the doctrine of Christ crucified and glorified: such a sense here would be discordant

with the objective tenor of the whole passage, and would give no advance of thought. It is the stumbling of fall, loss, punishment, punishment coming from the glorified Lord (for it is through the Stone that they stumble),—the thought of the loss, however, as coming by wilful folly and perversity being that which is prominent. It can hardly be doubted that before Peter's mind was present Christ's solemn application of the same passage from the 118th Psalm (Matt. xxi. 42, 44; Luke xx. 17, 18); and that application thus serves as a commentary on the apostle's meaning. Compare also Prov. iv. 19; Jer. xiii. 16. To some expositors it has seemed that the apostle, in attaching Isaiah's words λίθος προσκόμματος κτλ. to the Psalmist's statement regarding the stone's having been made the head of the corner, had before his mind a picture of the foundation-stone as projecting in some way on the surface, and thus tripping up heedless passers-by. The freedom found in the structure of Scripture imagery generally, and in particular the analogy of the Lord's language in His application of Ps. cxviii. 22 on the occasion just adverted to, show that there is no need for this somewhat awkward and difficult supposition. The thought which is carried forward from the one figurative sketch to the other, is simply that of the stone,—no more.—The influence of Peter's linking together in vv. 6–8 quotations from Isa. viii. 14, xxviii. 16, and Ps. cxviii. 22, is perhaps to be recognised in Barnab. Ep. vi. 2–4, where the same three passages are associated, the reference to Isa. viii. 14, however, being a little uncertain. But if the combination was suggested by a remembrance of Peter, this is all that can be said, for the quotations are considerably different in form.

In the relative clause οἳ προσκόπτουσιν κτλ., the dative τῷ λόγῳ may grammatically be connected with either the main verb or the participle; "who (*i.e.* of course, unbelievers, the antecedent being ἀπιστοῦσιν) stumble at the word, being disobedient" (so both A. and R. E. V.), or "who stumble,

being disobedient to the word" (so R. E. V. marg.). As to the former of these constructions, cf. Rom. ix. 32. In the present place the second mode of connection has much in its favour. *First*, it appears that this particular thought, "disobedience to the divine word," was one very familiar to Peter, seeing that of the three other places in which he employs the verb *ἀπειθεῖν*, one (iii. 1) has precisely the combination here, *ἀπειθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ*, with no ambiguity of construction, and another (iv. 17) the closely similar *ἀπειθεῖν τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ*. The circumstance that, differently from the order in these instances, the dative in the present verse stands *before* *ἀπειθοῦντες*, scarcely affects the weight of this argument, position being so largely determined by a writer's sense of rhythm or of emphasis. *Secondly*, it appears unnatural to represent "the word" directly as the stumbling-block, when from the language immediately preceding the mind instinctively carries forward the thought of the *stone*, *i.e.* the Lord Himself. *Thirdly*, the thought yielded most naturally by the combination *προσκόπτειν τῷ λόγῳ* is simply that of intellectual difficulty in the way of accepting the word, while the tenor of the whole passage, as has been seen, leads us to regard the conception as objective, "suffer loss, punishment." This thought is given by the other mode of connection,—"stumble, being (*i.e.* practically, in or through being) disobedient to the word."—The clause brings in an explanation of the statement which has just been made, that Christ is to unbelievers "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence;" "who stumble, namely (or "for they stumble," R. E. V.), inasmuch as they are disobedient to the word." The *unbelief* which is expressed in the antecedent *ἀπιστοῦσιν* is here in the relative clause stated to be, in fact (according to the uniform N. T. meaning of *ἀπειθεῖν*), *disobedience*, the issue from a perverse spirit (John iii. 18–20); and the disobedience is said to be to "the word," no doubt because the teaching which the apostle has given regarding the importance of the word and of spiritually assimilating it, in that paragraph

(i. 23–ii. 3) which led into the line of thought pursued in the section before us, is still in his mind. He aims, by his statement here that *ἀπιστία* is *ἀπείθεια*, to deepen in the thoughts of his Christian readers a sense of the vast importance of bearing ever in mind the definition which he has again and again given them of *πίστις*, as being *ὑπακοή*, *ὑπακοὴ τῆς ἀληθείας* (i. 2, 22).

In joining the *present* participle *ἀπειθοῦντες* to *προσκόπτουσιν*, the apostle teaches evidently that the disobedience and the stumbling are coincident. The disobedience involves of necessity—it is itself, in fact—prodigious loss, considering the nature, possibilities, and ends of a moral being; and as disobedience grows, spiritual death deepens.—On *εἰς ὃ ἐτέθησαν*, cf. as to phraseology and construction, 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11. In the connection it does not appear natural to regard as the antecedent to *ὅ* either the main verb of the preceding clause, or the participle, taken *separately*, but the whole statement,—the stress of the reference, however, falling naturally on the main verb. Unbelievers have been appointed or ordained by God to loss, punishment, as involved in, and necessarily resulting from, their disobedience to His word. The purpose of this little clause appears to be to deepen in the minds of the readers the conviction that the *προσκόπτειν* which has been spoken of is not something casual, but in the strictest sense *punishment from God*. This thought plainly is directly in the line of the whole paragraph. Peter's aim throughout is to incite his readers to cleave to Christ notwithstanding that the world around them, including multitudes more learned and in many ways more eminent than themselves, oppose and deride His claims. "Men rejected Christ; but God glorified Him. To those who believe, thus accepting God's judgement of Him, He is found to be an infinite security and honour; upon unbelievers, on the other hand—who by their unbelief join themselves, as regards judgement and treatment of Him, with the foolish and wicked builders—come condemnation and punishment from God." The *καί*, "also,"

is thus pretty nearly equivalent to "mark this other important fact in the case." On the use of *καί* in relative clauses, cf. A. Buttmann, p. 283.

Ver. 9. The apostle turns now, with a delight which is manifest in the richness and free flow of his language, from the contemplation of the sin and punishment of the unbeliever, to speak of the blessed estate of the Christian. In the first clause of ver. 7 he began the practical application of Isaiah's prediction with a brief reference to this pleasant side; but having afterwards dwelt longer on the painful aspect, he gladly takes up again, for more full exhibition, the position *ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.* A passage very similar in structure is Rom. ii. 6–10.—The description here by Peter of the condition of Christians is throughout a free adaptation of language used in O. T. regarding Israel,—the apostle thus obviously intimating in the most distinct way that the dignity and privileges connected with being the chosen people of God are enjoyed in their highest forms by the Church of Christ. Supposing, as seems likely (see Introduction, § II.), that those Christians to whom the Epistle was addressed were to a great extent members of Gentile races, it is easy to see how cheering and strengthening, amid the opposition of unconverted Jews and the narrowness and arrogance of many Christians of Jewish birth, must have been—particularly as coming from the great Apostle of the Circumcision—the teaching that the community of Christ's followers in all its length and breadth is the true spiritual Israel, the elect of God.

The first designation here applied to believers, "a chosen (and thus loved and blessed) race," is from Isa. xliii. 20. Believers form a *γένος*, "a body of common origin, a community of kinsfolk," inasmuch as they are all children of God; and they are such through the *ἐκλογή* of His sovereign love.—The next two titles in the description, "a kingly priesthood, a holy (consecrated) nation," are from Ex. xix. 6. The Hebrew for which *βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα* is the LXX. rendering is מַמְלֶכֶת כֹּהֲנִים, "a kingdom of priests," *i.e.* a priesthood form-

ing an organized community — people, body of subjects — under the immediate government of the Divine King. In Rev. i. 6, where the same passage is cited, such appears to be the thought given by the best supported text, *βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς*. By some scholars it has been thought that, whatever might be the sense intended by the Alexandrian translators in their rendering, the words *βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα*, as employed by Peter at least, ought perhaps to be taken with a force approaching that of the original Hebrew,—thus, "a priesthood belonging specially to the Divine King," on the analogy of such designations, natural enough in any language, as "royal chaplains, royal household," and the like. This supposition appears to be, in the connection in which the words occur here, somewhat forced, and is not at all needful. The N. T. writers not unfrequently, in passing references, employ LXX. language which represents the thought they wish to express, even though it may not happen to answer with perfect precision to the Hebrew in the place where it originally occurs. Indeed, they do this sometimes even in formal quotations, in cases where, though the form may be considerably different, yet, as regards general tenor, the translation substantially accords with the original: *e.g.* Rom. x. 20, 21, xi. 9, 10. It seems likely that in his free application here of the words in Exodus the apostle was acting in this way, and that the combination should be taken in the sense which undoubtedly is first suggested to a reader, that of "a kingly priesthood," the apostle by this condensed expression bringing out the truth that the glorious privilege of believers is to be at once kings and priests. — As distinguished from *γένος*, "a body having community of origin," *ἔθνος*, according to etymology, appears to be "a body organized through community in the usages of life (*ἔθη*)." This distinction has been adverted to by some expositors; but, whilst probably true, it seems hardly to have any claim to enter into the exegesis, strictly so called, of the passage, for there is nothing in the context leading to the thought that it was

specially before the apostle's mind.—As to *ἅγιον*, cf. note on *ἁγιασμῷ*, i. 2.

In the rest of the verse the apostle reverts to Isa. xliii., where immediately after the already cited *γένος ἐκλεκτόν* we find (ver. 21) *λαόν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην τὰς ἀρετάς μου διηγεῖσθαι*. This Peter freely quotes and expands. Considering the probable present application of the language by the apostle to Gentiles, it is important to bear in mind the frequent special use of *λαός* in LXX. and N. T. for Israel as the people of God's choice, the theocratic nation. For *ὃν περιεποιησάμην*, "which I acquired for myself," the apostle, apparently from a somewhat similar passage in Malachi (iii. 17) which flits into his memory, substitutes the equivalent *εἰς περιποίησιν*, "for a possession" (cf. Eph. i. 14). In Malachi the words are in connection with *ἔσονται*, and thus, to explain Peter's construction, we must supply the participle *ὤν*; as to this Hebraism, see ver. 7, *ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλήν*, note. The designation *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν* describes Christians as being, in a specially rich and full sense, "God's own," peculiarly prized and cared for. The words *εἰς περιποίησιν* appear to be as precisely as possible equivalent to the adjective *περιούσιος* (Tit. ii. 14), this latter word being the representative in Ex. xix. 5, and elsewhere, of the same Hebrew term סְגֻלָּה ("a treasure"), which in the passage in Malachi is rendered by *εἰς περιποίησιν*. The rendering of A. V. both in Tit. ii. 14 and here, "peculiar," is after the Vulgate *peculiaris*, and was no doubt meant by the translators to carry with it the special force of the Latin substantive *peculium*. On the precise force of *εἰς περιποίησιν* and *περιούσιος*, cf. an interesting discussion by Bishop Lightfoot, in the Appendix to his work, *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*.—The next clause sets forth the grand end for which believers are thus taken by God as "a people for His special possession," — namely, to show forth His glory. That in the apostle's mind the immediate connection of this clause of purpose was as just represented, — namely, with the words

λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, — may be inferred from the verse in Isaiah; but, of course, the force is substantially the same if we join it with the whole preceding description,—"Ye are a chosen race, etc., to the intent that."—Having in this citation from Isaiah substituted for the relative clause with its verb, ὃν περιεποιησάμην, an equivalent expression with a substantive, the apostle is naturally led, according to Greek usage, to substitute also in the following clause of purpose, ὅπως in place of the infinitive construction of LXX. For διηγεῖσθαι of LXX., too, Peter, moving quite freely in his choice of O. T. phraseology employed in various places to illustrate the same line of thought in which he is now engaged, substitutes ἐξαγγέλλειν, used in LXX. of proclaiming the praises of God (Ps. ix. 14, lxxviii. 13). The word occurs in N. T. only here. The thought of "telling *forth*," so as to make known far and wide, is evidently made prominent by the preposition of the compound. — Ἀρετή is used by Peter more than by any other of the N. T. writers, occurring, besides the present place, also in 2 Ep. i. 3, 5, — elsewhere only in Phil. iv. 8. In LXX. the word is not unfrequent, — the plural in particular, as in the passage of Isaiah on which Peter's present words are based, being employed to represent the Hebrew תְּהִלָּה or תְּהִלּוֹת, God's "praise" or "praises." The translators thus adopted a word which explicitly pointed to the *grounds* of the praise, the divine "excellences;" cf. Isa. xlii. 8, 12, lxiii. 7. Philo also employs the word in the same way (*Quis rer. div. hær.*, Mang. p. 488). Its reference appears to be quite general, like that of our English "excellences" in its widest use,—including God's power and wisdom as well as His moral perfections.

For the simple Θεοῦ or Κυρίου, answering to μου of Isaiah, Peter gives a magnificent paraphrase, pointing out the grandeur of the work done by God for and in believers, the consequent greatness of His claim upon their faithfulness and zeal in telling forth His excellences, and the special meetness of the duty to the condition of Christians,—enlightenment of the

dark world by those who out of darkness have been themselves brought into light. The particular form of this paraphrase was possibly suggested to Peter (cf. Phil. ii. 15) by a remembrance, as he wrote the words ὅπως κτλ., of that great statement regarding the vocation of Christians which was given by our Lord Himself in the Sermon on the Mount, "Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. v. 16). This precept of the Saviour is almost certainly referred to a few lines farther on (ver. 12), in ἵνα ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσι τὸν Θεόν, and from the identity of the thought with that in ὅπως τὰς ἀρετάς κτλ. could, one may reasonably suppose, scarcely but suggest itself already here,—bringing into the apostle's mind consequently the thought of *light*. While natural, however, the supposition is not necessary. Light and darkness are most familiar O. T. images for knowledge and ignorance, and by legitimate extension also for holiness and happiness and their opposites,—images the truth and beauty of which at once commend themselves to all. No description of the divine work of grace, therefore, could occur more readily than the exhibition of it as a calling out of darkness into light—light beautiful and benign as enjoyed in the Christian life here, and ever broadening and strengthening towards "the perfect day;" cf. Acts xxvi. 18; Col. i. 12, 13. In the passage before us the prepositions ἐκ and εἰς imply that before the writer's mind was the conception of spheres or regions of darkness and light respectively, in the one of which the natural man is, in the other the children of God. The light is *God's* light (αὐτοῦ), as kindred to—an outflow from—that light "full of glory" in which He dwells, which is indeed His own nature (1 John i. 5). The apostle's epithet θαυμαστόν—"marvellous" through transcendent sublimity—is echoed by the experience of every believer,—and this always the more fully as he grows in knowledge of himself and in knowledge of God. According to the analogy of general N. T. usage, by

τοῦ καλέσαντος is to be understood God the Father; cf. i. 15, note.

Ver. 10. To deepen in the hearts of his readers a sense of thankfulness to God, and thus to increase their zeal in "telling forth God's excellences," the apostle gives yet another word of description regarding the condition of Christians,—and this in the form of an impressive contrast between their former and their present spiritual state. This he clothes in language freely adapted from Hos. ii. 23 (cf. also Hos. i. 6, 8, ii. 1). This same verse of Hosea is formally cited by Paul in Rom. ix. 25, in a somewhat different connection of thought from that in which it appears here.—The sentence of ver. 9 is continued here, but with a change of form. From the simple predications "Ye are a chosen race," etc., we pass now to the construction of a participle with the article, equivalent to a relative clause,—a construction employed in the N. T. with even more freedom than by classical writers: "Ye are persons who," etc. In the first clause, the fact that the participle giving with οἱ the meaning "who were" is left to the mind to supply, perhaps aids a reader somewhat to give at once to οὐ the connection which from the passage in Hosea we see to be intended,—that is to say, not as negativing the copula, but as an integral part of the predicate,—thus, literally, "who were a not-people," *i.e.* a body of persons in whom the characteristic features of a λαός were not to be found; cf. Deut. xxxii. 21 (LXX.), ἐπ' οὐ Θεῷ, ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει. Hosea having "not-*My*-people" (τῷ οὐ λαῷ μου, LXX.), some expositors are of opinion that in the verse before us we are intended to regard the Θεοῦ of the antithetical clause following as belonging to this clause also. But this would be grammatically hard, and, as the apostle in his adaptation of the words of Hosea omits to give any representative of the pronoun μου which he found in Hosea, it appears reasonable to assume that he meant λαός to stand out here by itself before the minds of his readers. The thought underlying his language seems to be somewhat of this kind,—that, from a

religious point of view, the sinful world has no real community of life or of interest, but is merely an aggregate of isolated persons, the tendency of sin being ever, through the working of selfishness and hatred, toward social disintegration. The loneliness and dreariness of the unconverted state, especially amid the intense darkness and debasement of heathenism, appears to be the prominent idea; and thus, with a considerable difference in form, we seem to have a close resemblance in thought to the present statement, in ver. 25, *ἦτε ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι.* On the combination of *οὐκ* with a substantive, so as practically to make a compound, a mode of expression not without analogies in classical Greek, but to be regarded in the N. T. as due to the influence of Hebrew, and found, indeed, only in passages quoted from the LXX. (cf. Rom. x. 19), see Winer, p. 597; A. Buttmann, p. 353.—If *οἵ ποτε οὐ λαός* means what has now been said, of course the antithesis is a climax: "From this position of isolation you have passed through grace to become a real community, closely bound together in love by oneness in the most important interests; and not a people only, but the most glorious and blessed of all peoples, God's people."

The second clause of the verse is adapted from that which stands first in Hosea. There the ordinary text of the LXX. has *ἀγαπήσω τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην.* The apostle's rendering here by forms of *ἐλεεῖν*, which answers more exactly to the Hebrew, may be due either to his translating for himself, or possibly to the use of another text of the LXX. (some extant authorities for that version, indeed, particularly Codex A, having the forms from *ἐλεεῖν*). The force of *ποτέ* of the previous clause obviously repeats itself before *οὐκ ἠλεημένοι*, and here also the *οὐκ* joins itself completely to the predicate, so that we have not simply "not compassionated," but "uncompassionated." When a participle which has the article is negatived, the particle employed is in N. T. usage regularly *μή*, not *οὐκ*, antithetical passages like the present forming the only exception; cf. A. Buttmann, p. 350. In the use of the

perfect participle we have *state* presented. In their time of darkness, had any one of them obtained some true knowledge of the circumstances in which he was, he would have had to say, "We are and have been uncompassionated,"—that is, ἔλεος being "*active* pity," "We have not been visited by God with proofs of redemptive compassion and grace for us as sinners." But the *aorist* participle ἐλεηθέντες in the other division of the clause points to *definite acts* of mercy: "Now —since the day-spring from on high visited us—we are able to say Ἠλεήθημεν, glorious compassion was manifested to us in the work of our Saviour for us, in sending us the glad tidings of that work, and in leading us by the influences of the Holy Spirit to accept Him." On the combination of perfect and aorist participles, cf. Winer, p. 431. With respect to the use of νῦν with aorists, when the particle has a somewhat wide sense, as "since Christ came," or "since the knowledge of Christ was sent to us," cf. i. 12, note.

Vv. 11, 12. *Call to purity of life, with special enforcement of the thought that thus heathen onlookers may be led to glorify God.*

The second and much the longer subdivision of the hortatory part of the Epistle begins here. The first subdivision, extending from i. 13 to ii. 10, has dealt with those duties of Christians which spring out of their immediate relations to God, and their relations to fellow-Christians. In the second subdivision, which extends to v. 9, we have exhortations to duties arising out of the various relations in which men are placed in life, and advices and encouragements as to the spirit and conduct becoming believers exposed to persecution,—as evidently many of those were to whom in the first instance the apostle wrote. Throughout the whole of this portion of the Epistle, Peter seems to have vividly before his mind the special trials, difficulties, and duties of Christians who are surrounded by heathen, and of necessity brought into frequent intercourse with them. A ruling thought with him

everywhere is that by the purity of character of believers, the faithfulness with which they do their work in the various spheres occupied by them, and the meekness and patience with which they bear their troubles, even their adversaries may be drawn to recognise the presence in the Church of a power from heaven, and led themselves to join the Christian ranks. This thought has already appeared in the last clause of ver. 9, which prepared the way for the present section; and we have it set forth still more expressly in vv. 12, 15, iii. 1, 16. This specialty of aspect throughout this part of the letter obviously presents in itself an element of difference, even where, as occasionally, a precept which occurs here is in substance very nearly the same as one that has been given before,—for example, comparing ver. 11 with i. 14.

The exhortation in vv. 11, 12 is general in its character. It serves as an introduction to the subdivision, both by giving a summary statement of a wide range of Christian duty, and by definitely announcing the point of view, just adverted to, from which, in what follows, the apostle is about to look at the position of his readers.

Ver. 11. The affectionate word of address *ἀγαπητοί* is employed in this Epistle only here and in iv. 12,—in both places with great naturalness and force, as introducing exhortations of a kind in which the loving sympathy of the apostle with his readers was specially called forth, and would be felt as peculiarly refreshing. *Παρακαλῶ*, following on *ἀγαπητοί*, and written down amid the same pressure of affectionate feeling, is thus perhaps best taken, as in both A. and R. E. V., with something of its familiar entreating shade of meaning, "I beseech," rather than with the hortatory shade, also common, "I exhort."—On the omission of *ὑμᾶς* here (which, though not in the least causing ambiguity, still in such a connection as the present would be somewhat peculiar in any writer, and is specially remarkable in Hellenistic Greek), cf. Winer, p. 179.—In the words *ὡς* ("as beseems," *i.e.* practically, "since you are") *παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους*

there is something of a climax,—*πάροικοι*, "by-dwellers," being residents beside or among the citizens of a country, yet not *of* them, their own citizenship being elsewhere, whilst the designation *παρεπίδημοι*, substantially the same, adds, according to its ordinary use, the idea of brevity of residence, "sojourners." As to *παροίκους*, cf. i. 17, note; and as to *παρεπιδήμους*, i. 1, note. To some expositors (basing their opinion mainly on the expression "among the Gentiles" in ver. 12, and holding that this Epistle is addressed solely to Jewish Christians) it seems that by the words "strangers and sojourners" Peter simply refers to their being of the *διασπορά*, Jews absent from Palestine. By the mention of "Gentiles," however, as we shall see, a contrast with Jews is not in the Epistles of the N. T. necessarily suggested; and even if it were, the reference to Gentiles does not come in this verse. In any case, when we remember that the character of Christians was exposed to even more of keen and jealous observation by enemies of the truth in Palestine than in pagan lands, such an argument in support of an appeal to abstain from "fleshly lusts" as, "because ye are absent from Palestine," would manifestly be pointless and irrelevant in the extreme. On the other hand, the argument from the fact that Christians are citizens of heaven, called upon therefore during their sojourn on earth not to imbibe the spirit or live the life of citizens of this world, has plainly the greatest pertinence and force. With this view of the meaning the prominence which already in the Epistle has been given to the thought of heaven as the believer's inheritance and the object of lively hope (i. 3–5, 13) wholly accords; also the way in which *παροικία* is used in i. 17; and, still further, the language of David in a passage which one cannot reasonably doubt to have been in Peter's mind when he wrote the words now before us, Ps. xxxix. 12, "I am a stranger with thee and a sojourner" (*πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος*, LXX.).—We may join *ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους* either with the object of *παρακαλῶ* or with the subject of *ἀπέχεσθαι*; and it is of little moment which of

the constructions be adopted. If we join the words with the infinitive, it is then perhaps a shade easier to understand the omission of *ὑμᾶς*,—"I exhort (or, I make entreaty), as strangers and sojourners to abstain," etc.; cf. ver. 15 (where, however, the analogy is but slight). On the other hand, at the beginning of a long series of exhortations, all of which may legitimately be enforced by an appeal to the pilgrim state of the readers, it appears most natural to attach the words to *παρακαλῶ*, the introductory word of the whole section. This latter construction is therefore probably to be preferred: "I beseech you as strangers and sojourners, that ye abstain," etc.

Ἐπιθυμία, "desire," in itself a word of general reference (see *e.g.* Phil. i. 23), but quite predominantly in N. T., as by classical writers, used of *wicked* desire, is here defined as such by the adjective *σαρκική*,—*σάρξ* here, as so often in N. T., standing for the corrupt nature, which has its stimuli and instruments in the flesh.

The *ἐπιθυμίαι σαρκικαί* (otherwise *ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκός*, Eph. ii. 3, 2 Pet. ii. 18, and *ἐπιθυμίαι κοσμικαί*, Tit. ii. 12) are the different forms of the one pervasive *ἐπιθυμία σαρκός* spoken of in Gal. v. 16, the "fulfilling" of which is the opposite of "walking in the Spirit,"—"for the flesh lusteth (*ἐπιθυμεῖ*) against the Spirit." Prominent no doubt in Peter's mind among the "fleshly lusts" were desires for sinful indulgences of the flesh in the strict sense,—those desires which John gathers up under *ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός*, as he uses the expression with a specific reference (1 Ep. ii. 16),—particularly desires for those impurities which were so generally practised in heathen society of every rank that, conscience having becoming torpid with regard to them, they thus presented strong temptations even to converted heathen. The expression covers, however, much more than sensual desires, in the usual meaning of that phrase. Paul, in Gal. v. 19–21, gives a considerable list of the forms of feeling and conduct which fall under the name *τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός*; in which, beginning with impurities, he goes on to include "hatred,

wrath, envying, and such like,"—everything, in fact, which contrasts with "the fruit of the Spirit" (ver. 22).

The compound relative *αἵτινες* has in the connection, as frequently, the force of "seeing that they," *quippe quæ, utpote quæ;* cf. Eph. iii. 13; Phil. i. 28, and on the various uses of *ὅστις* see an excellent note by Ellicott on Gal. iv. 24.—The clause exhibits a lively and expressive figurative representation of the work of the "fleshly lusts." As usual with Peter (see i. 9, 22, ii. 25, iv. 19), *ψυχή* is here not looked at as distinct from *πνεῦμα* (as 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12), but as designating the whole inner nature,—intellect, affections, and will,—that immaterial element of our being whose salvation is the primary aim of divine grace, and against which Satan wars through his instruments, evil desires. These desires "campaign against the soul,"—strive like an armed band to destroy it, by obscuring its vision, troubling its peace, enfeebling its energies, dulling its interest in God and in fellowship with Him; cf. Philo (*Mund. Opif.*, Mang. p. 19), *πολέμου τοῦ κατὰ ψυχὴν, ὃς ἀψευδῶς ἐστι πολέμων ἀργαλεώτατος καὶ βαρύτατος.* A close parallel to the clause occurs in Jas. iv. 1. Polycarp (§ 5) has an obvious reference to it, in which, however, the form of expression is a little affected by a remembrance also of Gal. v. 17: *πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται.* A sentence, too, in the Epistle to Diognetus (§ 6) seems to be a reminiscence of this verse, though the form of the thought is a little different: *μισεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν ἡ σὰρξ καὶ πολεμεῖ, διότι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς κωλύεται χρῆσθαι.*

Ver. 12. The participial clause here presents the duty in a positive form, and under a special aspect, its force being, "thus having," etc. This clause implies that whilst, in accordance with the radical character of all the ethical teaching of Christianity, the duty enjoined has been enunciated in ver. 11 in very comprehensive terms, yet at the moment the *outward* forms of indulgence in the "fleshly lusts" were specially before the apostle's mind, because he was mainly

occupied with the thought of influence on others.—The use of the nominative ἔχοντες, instead of the grammatically regular accusative ἔχοντας, is in accordance with a tendency, found not unfrequently in the Epistles, to give to participial clauses which contain a particularly important thought more prominence and independence of form than they might otherwise have, by employing the nominative even where regular construction would require an oblique case; cf. Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 16; and see Winer, p. 716. A number of scholars have held (recently T. S. Green, *N. T. Gram.* p. 180), that in at least some of these cases, including that now before us, the participial clause is not to be looked upon as merely a secondary part of the sentence, but that the participle is meant to have an independent *imperative* force. This is satisfactorily answered by Dr. Moulton (Winer, p. 732, note 5). Indeed, as regards any form of independent sentence, there appears much reason to doubt whether a mere participle is ever in N. T. style, as has often been supposed, employed, on Hebrew analogies, to represent a main verb; see an excellent discussion by A. Buttmann, p. 291 foll.

The words ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν are attached to the clause in a somewhat loose fashion, which, however, is perfectly natural and intelligible. Their immediate grammatical connection may be regarded to be in either of two ways. It may be looked upon as with τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν, "Your mode of life among the Gentiles;" for the substantive ἀναστροφή, being cognate with a verb which would be construed with the preposition ἐν, accommodates itself most readily to the simple addition of the adverbial combination, without repetition of the article (Winer, p. 170; A. Buttmann, p. 92). Indeed a repeated τήν would scarcely be suitable here, seeing that it would at least appear to limit the range of the obligation of moral comeliness to those departments of life which were under the eye of the heathen. But the connection may also be regarded as with the participle ἔχοντες. Looking at what seems to be the exact logical relation of the words in question

to the rest of the clause, this latter construction is the preferable. Of course, whatever had been the surroundings of the apostle's readers, he would have called on them to have life morally comely; but the words ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν bring in an argument additional to those which might have been in force in other circumstances,—thus, "remembering specially that you are among the Gentiles."—The contrast with Gentiles here does not necessarily imply that the persons addressed by the apostle were Jews, and nothing in the context naturally suggests that they were. In the Epistles, the name "Gentile" often has a purely *religious* reference, "heathen,"—the ethnical sense passing so out of view that Greeks and Romans cease to be spoken of as Gentiles when they accept Christianity, unless the specifically Jewish use of the word is in some way directly suggested. For a short discussion of this point, see Introduction, § II. 3.—***Καλήν*** is obviously predicative; and its position at the end of the clause gives it a certain sharp emphatic force; "thus having your mode of life—particularly remembering that it is lived among the Gentiles—comely." In the connection which the word has here, its radical sense is plainly prominent, the apostle's thought being of the *beauty* of holiness.—Polycarp (§ 10) seems to have quoted this clause, the Latin version giving *conversationem vestram irreprehensibilem habentes in gentibus.*

There is no reason for taking ἐν ᾧ in any other than its most obvious meaning, "in the matter (sphere, field) in which;" cf. Rom. ii. 1, xiv. 22. The apostle's thought is, "that in the very sphere—namely, your Christian life—where, superficially looked at, your enemies now imagine themselves to find grounds for harsh accusations, they may by and by through the leadings of God's grace see, looking more heedfully, ground for praising Him as the Giver of moral excellence." By some expositors the *temporal* use of ἐν ᾧ, "at which time, whilst" (Mark ii. 19; John v. 7), has been thought of here; but this is quite unsuitable, the time of δοξάσωσι being not coincident with, but subsequent to, that of καταλαλοῦσιν.

The sense of "whereas" (A. E. V., after *pro eo quod* of Beza) is in itself suitable enough to the passage, but is unsupported by the use of ἐν ᾧ elsewhere. On the various uses of ἐν ᾧ, cf. Winer, pp. 482, 484, and a good note of Alford on Heb. ii. 18. —In ὡς κακοποιῶν the ὡς marks κακοποιοί as the name which was given to the Christians by the καταλαλοῦντες, or as summing up the allegations which were made against them; cf. A. Buttmann, p. 307. This name κακοποιοί suggested (see ver. 14), just as "evil-doers" does with us, that whether as a matter of fact the followers of Christ were dealt with by the tribunals or not, their conduct, the issue of their peculiar principles, deserved to be punished by the judges. In being subjected to such a charge, the Christians were bearing the cross after their Lord (John xviii. 30). Both by N. T. and by secular writers it is shown that calumny, and calumny taking this particular form, the charge of *criminal* conduct, arose against the Church very early and prevailed very widely. The Jews in Rome, at the time when Paul arrived there, stated, as the sum of their knowledge about Christians, that they were "a sect everywhere spoken against" (Acts xxviii. 22). At this stage probably the main accusation was the same which had been made against the Lord (John xix. 12), a charge of disloyalty to the Emperor, and, associated with this, of a revolutionary spirit generally, a disposition to "turn the world upside down" (Acts xvii. 6). That this was the most prominent form among the calumnies to which the Churches directly addressed by the apostle were subjected, is likely from the fact that he begins immediately (ver. 13 foll.) to speak to them on the subject of obedience to constituted authority. With the charge of revolutionary tendencies as regarded the State, was probably associated, as we may infer from exhortations which follow (ver. 18 foll., iii. 1, 7), the accusation of stirring up discords and disorderliness in households. Somewhat later, in all likelihood, was the rise of calumnies of a yet more unjust and indeed utterly monstrous kind, of which we read,—charges of the practice of gross impurities and cruel-

ties in the Christian gatherings, and the like. So widely diffused among all classes of the heathen did belief in atrocious falsehoods of this kind become, that even a philosophic historian like Tacitus could speak of the *Christianos per flagitia invisos,* while their religion presented itself to him as *exitiabilis superstitio* (*Ann.* xv. 44); and similarly to Suetonius the *Christiani* appear a *genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ* (*Nero,* 16).

In the clause introduced by ἵνα, rigid regularity and completeness of construction would have given us ἐν τούτῳ, "in that field," as grammatical antecedent to ἐν ᾧ. Instead of this, the apostle sets before us what may be described as the *fruits* which are produced in the field of a true Christian ἀναστροφή, and which cannot but be seen by the watchful eyes of the heathen passers-by. These fruits are the καλὰ ἔργα which will be discerned in every department of a believer's conduct, in proportion to the intelligence and liveliness of his faith. As already noticed under ver. 9, there appears to be in this clause a distinct reminiscence of our Lord's precept in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 16), λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν κτλ.—The use of the article in τῶν καλῶν ἔργων implies a reference to ἔχοντες τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν καλήν,—these words, of course, clearly assuming that the separate ἔργα which make up the ἀναστροφή are καλά: on definiteness thus given by implication in a previous word, cf. note on ἡ τιμή in ver. 7.

The verb ἐποπτεύειν occurs in N. T. in Peter only (here and iii. 2); the cognate substantive also (2 Ep. i. 16). This word intimates here that, whilst the source of the καταλαλιαί is the ἀγνωσία (ver. 15) connected with listening to foolish hearsay, or with utter superficiality of observation, on the other hand "eye-witness," in any worthy sense of the word—real personal contemplation of a Christian's mode of life—may reasonably be expected to lead to a recognition that in Christianity the power of heaven is present, and thus to bring the observer to glorify God. It will have this effect with all who have

not entirely blinded within them that faculty which, even in unregenerate men, testifies to the original image of God,—the faculty which

> "Feels how awful goodness is, and sees
> Virtue in her shape how lovely."

Through the use of the present ἐποπτεύοντες we have the viewing from day to day set before us, whilst the aorist δοξάσωσι points to the great decisive *act* which the apostle trusts will come "in the day of visitation,"—the acceptance of the evidence that Christianity is from God, and thus the surrendering of the soul to glorify God by personal faith.—The participle ἐποπτεύοντες stands in the sentence somewhat peculiarly, through the absence of an expressed object. Having substantially the force of διὰ τοῦ ἐποπτεύειν, it is closely interwoven with the main thought; but its absoluteness, as regards construction, makes it resemble a parenthesis,—"that by means of your good works—witnessing (them)—they may glorify God;" cf. ἀναγινώσκοντες, Eph. iii. 4. On the substance of the present clause, cf. iii. 1, 2.

The closing words, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς, are in form so general that various meanings may be attached to them. God is often in O. T. said to "visit" men, and this either for purposes of mercy (*e.g.* Job x. 12; Ps. viii. 4) or purposes of judgement (Isa. x. 12; Jer. vi. 15). The meaning here might thus be, "when God visits the calumniating heathen for judgement,"—and that either in this life, by sending affliction, or at the great day of final account. On this view of the sense, however, with either of these references, the words do not appear to connect themselves very naturally with the main thought of the clause, that regarding the influence of personal contemplation of the good works of believers; and, supposing the reference to be to the last day, then the force of δοξάζειν would be different from that which the rest of the clause leads a reader to expect. By some expositors the apostle's expression has been supposed to indicate a minute and formal investigation, whether strictly judicial or other,

made by the heathen themselves into the conduct of Christians. But this mode of interpretation, besides yielding a somewhat jejune meaning, is not accordant with the *usus loquendi* as to ἐπισκοπή and its verb ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, when employed in any such connection as the present,—and especially as regards the combination ἡμέρα or καιρὸς ἐπισκοπῆς (Isa. x. 3, LXX.; Luke xix. 44). The natural reference of the expression, as here used, seems certainly to be to visitation by God, not by man. In the *New* Testament, wherever either the verb or the noun is used of a divine visitation, a gracious one is always referred to (Luke i. 68, 78, vii. 16, xix. 44; Acts xv. 14; Heb. ii. 6). We may therefore most safely take the meaning here also to be "in the day of (God's) visitation (in mercy)," —a sense which accords with the whole tone of the passage, and also with the closely similar passage, iii. 1, 2. In language which, from the general interest of the occasion, and from the fact that the immediate reference was to his own work in the house of Cornelius, Peter could hardly have forgotten, and may well have had present to his mind as he was writing the words before us, the Apostle James said that "God had visited (ἐπεσκέψατο) the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His name" (Acts xv. 14); and in thinking here of the calumnious opponents of believers, Peter's hope is that for these particular Gentiles there may come a "day" of this dealing of grace.

Vv. 13–17. *On the duty of obedience to civil rulers.*

This section contains the first of the apostle's exhortations to duties which arise out of particular relations of ordinary life. It deals with the relations of subjects to their rulers. To persons of a lively imagination, and whose minds at the same time are ill-informed and ill-regulated, the doctrine of Christ regarding His kingdom on earth may easily present itself in such a form as to imply the reasonableness, and

indeed obligation, of disregarding other rule. A tendency to error of this kind has been often shown during the history of the Church, appearing particularly, as was to be expected, in times of religious upturning and excitement, as among the German Anabaptists at the Reformation, and among the extreme sectaries in the time of the English Commonwealth. Missionaries find that they have occasionally to deal with the same error at the present day.[1] Where, as with those Asiatic communities to whom Peter wrote, the rulers were themselves heathen, the tendency to doubt whether duty called on or permitted Christians to give obedience to these rulers was obviously specially apt to show itself; and positive antagonism to Christ exhibited by the rulers, through persecuting His followers, might readily fan what otherwise would have remained mere theory into a flame of feeling resulting in conduct very injurious to the interests of the Church. It is evident that the primitive Christian teachers were deeply impressed with a sense of the hazard of their converts falling into what might prove most serious errors on this subject; for, in Romans, Paul similarly has devoted a considerable paragraph to teaching and warnings respecting the duty of civil obedience (xiii. 1–7). That passage and the present are mutually illustrative. To Titus also Paul gives a special injunction with regard to ministerial duty in the matter of setting forth truth on this point (iii. 1). The influence exerted on the early Church by this apostolic teaching is strikingly shown by the boldness of the statement which Justin Martyr felt himself justified in making with respect to the habitual dutifulness, as subjects, of the Christians throughout the empire (I. *Apol.* 17).

Ver. 13. The connection of thought is no doubt correctly given by *οὖν* of T. R.; but MS. authority is decidedly for the omission of the conjunction. Occasionally elsewhere the

[1] A friend of the writer, a missionary in India of long experience, requested some young helpers in Scotland, who were engaged in writing or painting texts in the native language for his mission rooms, to include 1 Pet. ii. 17, and this expressly because he found mistakes on the subject of relations to civil authority prevalent among his converts.

apostle begins a period without a connective word; cf. i. 22. —Remembering the necessity of divine influence for sanctification, we may take ὑποτάγητε here, ταπεινώθητε (v. 6), or any other similar moral precept couched in a passive form, as really passive in meaning. Such exhortations, however, naturally take a reflexive form, and the unquestionable tendency of later Greek, illustrated often in N. T., to use passive aorists with the force of the middle voice, makes it highly probable that the apostle's thought was "subject yourselves" or "be subject," rather than "be subjected:" cf. Winer, p. 327; A. Buttmann, pp. 51, 52.

Κτίσις, in the various applications which it has in N. T. use, coincides throughout with our English "creation,"—designating (1) the act (Rom. i. 20); (2) the product of the act, collectively (Col. i. 15); (3) one particular product of the act, "*a* creation," = κτίσμα, "a creature" (Heb. iv. 13). In every passage of the N. T. where κτίσις or any of its cognates occurs, except the passage now before us, the reference is to *God's* work; and the combination here, πᾶσα ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, regarded simply by itself, would naturally in the first instance be taken, similarly, as meaning "every human creature (of God)." Some expositors have held to this sense, regarding the precept as analogous to those found in Rom. xii. 10, "to prefer one another in honour;" Eph. v. 21, "to be subject (ὑποτάσσεσθαι, as here) to one another in the fear of Christ;" and in another part of our present Epistle (v. 5), "Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility to serve one another." The view that in meaning the present precept is similar to these, however, is not tenable. The peculiar form of the exhortation, in which the appeal for mutual subjection, so prominent in all the others, is wanting, and the remarkable intensity of the periphrasis chosen for the simple παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ, constitute a considerable difficulty in the way of accepting it, though not perhaps, taken alone, an insuperable one. But having regard to the division of κτίσει which immediately follows, presenting in the first instance solely different classes

of magistrates, εἴτε βασιλεῖ εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν, and in subsequent sections relations of life which, from their nature, imply rule on the one side and subjection on the other,—to the manifest main reference of the paragraph, as a whole, to civil government,—and to the fact that, whilst the duty of "honouring all men" is enjoined in the 17th verse, that precept enters by a line of thought connected with the closing words of the verse and of the paragraph, "honour the king," we cannot doubt that the meaning of the injunction before us is not at all so wide as "Be subject to every human creature." Κτίσις appears to be undoubtedly employed here—in a way strange to Hellenistic usage, but which to the Asiatic Christians, accustomed to hear κτίζω and its derivatives employed with much freedom of reference in the Greek of their heathen neighbours, would not appear unnatural or hard—for "a creation" of man's thought, "an institution;" and this is limited by the preceding ὑποτάγητε, by that mention of magistrates which immediately follows, and which is placed in closest connection with this word, and by the tenor of the following section, to an institution for rule in a State, or generally in such societies, required or naturally brought about by God's arrangements, as involve subordination,—a household, for example.

To some interpreters (as Hofmann and Huther) it appears that definition of the object of the particular kind of κτίσις meant by the apostle is intended by him in using the adjective ἀνθρωπίνῃ, which they understand to signify "applying to human relations," and explain to mean here particularly "for man in his *social* relations." But obviously nothing is thus gained, for the specific part of this explanation, namely, "in his social relations," does not lie in the Greek word, but is a supplement gathered from the context. Looking at the apparent antithesis between this adjective and διὰ Κύριον, it seems far more natural to take ἀνθρωπίνῃ in the sense of origin, "devised by man." The form of mistake into which Christians were apt to fall is readily inferred from the nature of the case, and is made evident by the emphasis with which

our apostle presents his *διὰ Κύριον*, and with which, in Rom. xiii. 1–6, Paul enunciates and reiterates the position that "the powers that be are ordained of God," magistrates being thus "ministers of God." The error was this: "Seeing that we are now governed immediately by a Divine King, whose laws we know from His word, and with whom we have direct communication through His Spirit, and that earthly princes and magistrates are merely human creations, — man-made institutions, full of ignorance and often of wickedness,—we are therefore free from their authority, not bound to obey them, indeed bound not to obey them." Considering that this was plainly the nature of the mistake,—and that the peculiar sense of *κτίσις* found in the present passage was one much more likely to suggest itself to persons familiar with the free uses of *κτίζω* and its derivatives in ordinary Greek than to a Jew, to whom "create" was a sacred word, employed only of God's work,—it seems reasonably probable that the combination *ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις* had become known to the apostle as one occasionally, or often, employed among converts from heathenism (perhaps specially among those Asiatic believers to whom he now wrote) in discussions on the duty of Christians to earthly authorities. This probable enough supposition satisfactorily explains the peculiar form of expression.

In the paragraph already referred to in Rom. xiii., Paul lays stress on the fact that civil government is "an ordinance of God." It is such, not through the same express kind of appointment as that which, for example, constitutes private or social prayer His ordinance, but through the fact that—from the instincts which He has implanted in men, and the necessities arising out of the circumstances in which He has placed them —He has called on them to live in society, and this organized, that is to say, under magistracy of some kind. The *form* which government takes in any particular nation is determined by the thoughts and actions of men themselves, and is thus a *κτίσις ἀνθρωπίνη*; but civil government, taken generally, being an absolutely needful element in social life, is a *κτίσις θεία*.

Peter in the verse before us says, not διὰ Θεόν, but διὰ τὸν Κύριον; and Κύριος, according to ordinary N. T. usage (followed by our apostle; cf. ii. 3 and iii. 15, true reading), designates Christ. By this word, therefore, whilst suggesting the same thoughts about the basis of magistracy which Paul explicitly sets forth in Romans (seeing that "by Christ all things consist"), he also presents motives to obedience specially connected with the Saviour. "For the Lord's sake" means, when expanded—(1) "because of the teaching of the Lord, personally (Matt. xxii. 17–21) as well as through His apostles; and (2) from regard to the interests of His Church." This latter motive has been already illustrated in ver. 12, and is dwelt on again in vv. 15, 16.

In that specification of forms of "human institutions" for civil rule, into which, to give distinctness and impressiveness to his exhortation, the apostle now enters, he naturally selects the functionaries of that particular system under which his readers were placed. By the absence of the article, "king" and "governors" are spoken of quite generally; but in the first instance the king intended was the Roman Emperor. He was freely called "king" by the Greeks, the Jews, and his other Eastern subjects (cf. John xix. 15), though the Romans curiously imagined themselves to retain something of independence by calling their lord not *rex*, but *imperator*. Remembering, then, that the system of government which was immediately within the view of the Apostles Paul and Peter, when they earnestly exhorted their converts to obey all constituted civil authority, was a harsh despotism, and that the despot reigning at the time was Nero, we see clearly the wide and unhesitating sweep of the inspired injunction. Authority recognised by those among whom Providence has cast a Christian's lot is, even though it may have originated in crime and may be exercised with much iniquity, still to be obeyed, so long as the civil ruler keeps within his sphere, and does not traverse commands of the Supreme King. Faithful obedience to civil government is abundantly com-

patible with that free and manly spirit which the principles of Christianity are fitted to generate, and with most vigorous exertion to have bad laws abrogated and good laws enacted. With altogether abnormal conditions the teaching of the apostles does not directly deal; but it may safely be said that, where exceptional circumstances cast a Christian among the excitements of a political revolution, he will find that intelligent obedience to constituted authority in quieter times has, through the blessing of the Spirit, matured in him moral wisdom and strength with respect to the questions which he has to consider and determine.—The particle ὡς before ὑπερέχοντι, and (ver. 14) before δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις κτλ., has its frequent subjective force, = "remembering him (them) to be," or the like; the grounds being thus introduced why respect and deference should be shown, in measures and forms accordant with the positions of the various magistrates. Ὑπερέχοντι, which involves a comparative idea, seems here clearly, from the mode in which respectively "king" and "governors" are named, with a descriptive phrase attached to each, to mean "chief magistrate," the comparison being with the governors. In Rom. xiii. 1, the only other place in N. T. where this word occurs with reference to civil dignity, it is employed of all magistrates, "*higher* powers," the comparison being with the people generally.

Ver. 14. The "governors" (heads of provinces or similar districts—the designation applying practically to all regularly appointed subordinate magistrates) are to be obeyed, inasmuch as they are commissioned from time to time (this is the force of the present participle πεμπομένοις) through him—the king—for the vindication of justice on evil-doers and for the praise of well-doers. The words δι' αὐτοῦ distinctly *suggest* ὑπὸ Κυρίου, the chief of the state being the minister of the Lord in commissioning the subordinate magistrates; but the expression certainly does not itself *mean* "by Him (the Lord)," as some expositors have supposed. Nothing in the connection leads specially to the thought either of Christ as

Mediator, or of that prominence of the immediate agency of the Divine Being in carrying out His own purposes, which is occasionally expressed by the preposition διά (as Rom. xi. 36; Heb. ii. 10); and only in the one or the other of these ways could a reference of δι' αὐτοῦ to the Lord be explained. Besides, on this view of the meaning, the position of these words in the sentence would seem altogether singularly to confine to subordinate magistrates the Lord's providential relations.—Ἐκδίκησις, meaning simply "the vindication of justice," may govern a genitive either of those whose rights are vindicated (as Luke xviii. 7, 8), or, as here, of those upon whom the claims of justice are asserted by punishment.—The reference of ἔπαινος here is, of course, to practical commendatory recognition, rather than to words of praise,—the recognition of well-doers which a magistrate can give, moreover, being in the vast majority of cases simply the securing to them of peace and liberty, and only in exceptional instances the bestowal of positive honours of any kind.—A direct connection of εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κτλ. with ὑπερέχοντι, as well as with δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις, is not grammatically impossible; thus, "whether to the king, as holding supreme authority—or to governors, as commissioned through him—for the punishment," etc. But this structure is not a very natural one. The purpose of the king's authority, however, suggests itself quite readily from the other clause. The true end of civil government, God's end in instituting it, is in the verse represented by the apostle as being to some extent in the mind of the king in sending forth his subordinate magistrates,—and thus also, of course, by implication, as being the view which the monarch entertains of the purpose of his own position and power. By very many magistrates, no doubt, both supreme and subordinate, this grand end of their functions has been in great measure forgotten; but the duty of the Christian is to honour civil government as designed for a noble and gracious end.

Ver. 15. Well-doing—excellence of conduct in all depart-

ments of life, and thus here particularly in the relations of subjects to their rulers—is, according to the divine will, to be the great *apologia* of Christianity. Through consistent obedience shown by the followers of Christ to constituted authority (the participle *ἀγαθοποιοῦντας* in the connection evidently = *διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοποιεῖν*), the calumnies of the foolish men spoken of in ver. 12—for to them clearly the article in *τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων* points—are to be put to silence. In his form of expression here the apostle has a lively personification, for the spiritual ignorance of the men is represented to be the utterer of the calumnies,—*ἀγνωσία* being always disposed *statt der Augen immer den Mund offen zu haben* (Wiesinger).—Some scholars are inclined to connect *οὕτως* with *ἀγαθοποιοῦντας* or with *φιμοῖν*—thus, "because it is the will of God that by well-doing in this way (*i.e.* submission to civil authority) ye silence," or "that in this way, by well-doing, ye silence." The sense is good; but according to Greek usage the arrangement of words is decisively against the construction. *Οὕτως* is no doubt to be taken predicatively, as in Matt. i. 18, xix. 10. Thus employed, the adverb, answering exactly to "on this wise," is felt by a reader to be a little less sharply definite in form, a little more general, than the demonstrative pronoun would be. On the N. T. use of adverbs as predicates, not uncommon also in classical Greek, cf. Winer, p. 584; A. Buttmann, p. 131. A specially interesting case is the adverbial use of *ἴσα* in Phil. ii. 6.—The infinitive clause is plainly an expansion of the predicate *οὕτως*; cf. 1 Thess. iv. 3, with Ellicott's note. The omission of *ὑμᾶς*, the subject of *φιμοῖν*, is easily understood from the generality of the thought —much more easily than the omission of the same pronoun in ver. 11. The form for the infinitive here, *φιμοῖν*, in place of the regular *φιμοῦν*, appears to have preponderant MS. authority. Similarly in Matt. xiii. 32 and Mark iv. 32 the best supported form seems to be *κατασκηνοῖν*, and in Heb. vii. 5, *ἀποδεκατοῖν*; cf. Tischendorf, note on Heb. vii. 5, and

Westcott and Hort, *Introd.* § 410, and *App.* p. 166. The verb φιμόω means properly "to muzzle;" but, except in two quotations of a passage from the LXX. (1 Cor. ix. 9; 1 Tim. v. 18), the secondary sense "to silence" is alone employed in N. T., *e.g.* Matt. xxii. 34; Mark i. 25.—In the word ἀγνωσία, as used by the Hellenistic writers, the element of moral blameworthiness ("ignorance which is wilful or obstinate") appears to be more prominent than in ἄγνοια; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 34; Job xxxv. 16; Wisd. xiii. 1; also Clem. Rom. § 59. Whilst, in so far as it is wilful, ἀγνωσία of God and of duty to Him is in itself supreme folly (cf. Rom. i. 22), the apostle, in describing these men as also ἄφρονες, probably refers particularly to the folly of their conduct in denouncing a system of thought and of life which they had not taken pains to understand.

Ver. 16. The syntactical structure of the closing part of this section is somewhat doubtful. The sentence beginning with ὑποτάγητε (ver. 13) may be supposed to end with ver. 15, and vv. 16, 17 to constitute another—thus, "As free," etc., "honour all men," etc. The form of sentence which vv. 16, 17, taken together, would thus give us—a participial clause leading the way to an imperative—is something of a favourite with our apostle (*e.g.* i. 14, 15, 22, ii. 1, 2); but the arrangement is not satisfactory in this place. The contents of ver. 16 have no special relevancy as an introduction to at least one part of ver. 17, namely the precept, "Love the brotherhood;" whilst more naturally, perhaps, than they lead even into the other precepts of that verse, they attach themselves to the whole of what has preceded, describing in some detail the state of spirit which will reveal itself in the "well-doing" of subjection to civil authority. Accepting, then, the connection of ver. 16 with what precedes, we may attach it specially to ver. 15, as meant to expand the idea intended in ἀγαθοποιοῦντας,—the transition to the nominative being in accordance with that occasional irregular usage in the construction of participial clauses which is explained in note on

ἔχοντες of ver. 12. Or, keeping to regularity of construction, we may connect ὡς ἐλεύθεροι κτλ. immediately with ὑποτάγητε (ver. 13); and this best without making ver. 15 a formal parenthesis, for ver. 16, even if taken immediately with ὑποτάγητε, yet in fact expands and explains the general term ἀγαθοποιοῦντας of ver. 15—or, more exactly, enunciates the principles which, as motives, will lead to ἀγαθοποιία. On the whole, this last connection, by which ver. 16 illustrates in the first instance ὑποτάγητε, and thus really also the whole passage, vv. 13–15, seems the preferable.

Believers know themselves to be through grace free, "the Lord's freedmen" (1 Cor. vii. 22),—free from the condemning sentence of the divine law,—from slavish fear,—from the thraldom of sin. This truth may in various ways be misunderstood and abused; and many passages in the apostolic letters show that in the primitive Church, as often since, misapprehension and abuse of it did in fact find place. The freedom of Christians from the law as a condemning power was, by the monstrous heresy of Antinomianism, twisted to mean freedom from the obligation of obedience to the law as a rule of life; and by many also, as we may fairly infer from the present paragraph and the similar teaching of Paul, the general notion of Christian freedom was thought of as including emancipation from subjection in various of the ordinary relations of life. The mode in which the correction of all such misconceptions is to be obtained is evidently through coming clearly to understand the paradox that, gloriously true as is the doctrine of Christian freedom, yet at the same time the only possible moral condition for man is that of δουλεία to the one or the other of two masters. In being delivered from the position of "absolute servants of sin" (δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Rom. vi. 17; John viii. 34)—a servitude which, being wholly alien from the true end of man's existence, is slavery—we pass at once, from the very nature of the case, into the position of "absolute servants of God" (δοῦλοι Θεοῦ)—a service which is true freedom: cf. John viii. 31–36;

Rom. vi. 14–23 ; 1 Cor. vii. 22, 23. This is substantially what the apostle teaches in this verse. "Be subject, I beseech you, brethren, to those who have the rule over you,—remembering that you are freemen, and at the same time not deeming that you have this freedom as (*i.e.* that, possessing it, you have a right to employ it as,—a use of ἔχειν somewhat wider than in ver. 12, stretching toward the sense found in Matt. xiv. 5, xxi. 26, 46 ; Phil. ii. 29) a covering of wickedness (a covering fitted to hide wickedness from conscience and from divine justice), but ever keeping in mind that you are God's servants." On the middle clause, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 19, 20 ; Gal. v. 13.

As is assumed in the rendering just given, ὡς seems in this verse—from the prominence which it has, being used to introduce each clause—to have its frequent subjective force, "deeming that you are, that you have," etc. (as in ver. 14). The repetition of the particle intimates that the apostle would have all the thoughts distinctly present to the minds of his readers, the second and third thought modifying the first, which, taken alone in a certain aspect, might seem to be inconsistent with the injunction "Be subject." The second ὡς might suitably enough be taken with ἐπικάλυμμα. But ἀλλά before δοῦλοι plainly answers to μή of the middle clause, and accordingly ὡς ἔχοντες must go together, corresponding to ὡς δοῦλοι (ὄντες).—Whilst either "cloak" or "veil," in the familiar figurative sense of these words, may serve as a translation, the metaphor in ἐπικάλυμμα (a word occurring only here in N. T.) is quite general ; cf. in LXX. Ex. xxvi. 14, where the word is used of the covering of the tabernacle, 2 Sam. xvii. 19, where it is the covering of a cistern.—If the article with κακίας be other than simply an indication of the abstract, the sense must be hypothetical,—"the wickedness which the words already written, ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες, imply as existing in any one of whom they could truthfully be said."

Ver. 17. Occasionally, near the end of the apostolic letters, after the detailed statements, discussions, and appeals, there

occur, quite naturally, groups of brief exhortations, given simply as they presented themselves to the writer's mind, and in which, therefore, it is not needful or reasonable to look for a closely connecting line of thought; *e.g.* 1 Thess. v. 15–22. It is plain, however, that such a group of isolated precepts could not well present itself naturally in the present part of our Epistle; and when we find the last precept of ver. 17 to be "Honour the king," and remember the tenor of the context from ver. 13 onward, we see at once that the clauses of the verse must be closely associated in thought with each other and with what precedes, and we have also suggested to us what the link is. As has been seen from the previous verses, the peculiar temptation to which partially enlightened Christians were exposed, as regarded their relation to various forms of authority, lay in the thought that, being "the Lord's freedmen," they were thus emancipated from their obligations to their earthly rulers. But another aspect of their position also might influence them. They were not free merely; they were also, through Christ, placed in a new sphere of life, amid new surroundings, under new influences. As these Asiatic Christians had been expressly told (Eph. ii. 5, 6), they had been "quickened with their Lord, and made to sit with Him in the heavenly places." Through misunderstanding of this delightful representation of Christian privilege, there might readily arise among persons of a mystical temperament a belief that, having passed *εἰς τὰ ἐπουράνια*, they were released not only from obedience to earthly authorities, but from all obligations to unbelievers, and perhaps called on to shun even ordinary intercourse with them. Being "children of light," in immediate fellowship with "the Lord of glory," what had Christians to do any more with men who were only of this world? Their duty, it might appear, was solely to "fear God" and—the immediate corollary of that—to "love the brotherhood."

To obviate errors of this kind, the apostle in a singularly pointed way sums up his teaching on the whole subject by giving four injunctions, in which the duties liable to be

questioned are set down with equal definiteness side by side with those duties which all would admit,—the reader being thus invited to think out for himself the perfect consistency with each other, and the various mutual relations, of all the members of the group of precepts. In this way the group is made up of two pairs, in each of which is an injunction to a duty universally recognised by believers, and one to a duty which, through mistaken views of Christian doctrine, some might doubt,—the first pair having reference to duties toward equals, the other to duties involving subordination and obedience. In the first pair the duty which was questioned by some stands first, and that which all admitted, second. In the other pair, the order is reversed. The ground of this arrangement is obvious, the places of chief prominence and emphasis—namely, that at the beginning of the series, and that at the end—being given to those duties regarding which doubts were or might be entertained, and upon which, therefore, it was desirable to fix special attention.

"*Honour all men.* Have respect to man as man. Appreciate in all those with whom you are brought into contact everything which is worthy of esteem; and, in all your dealings, show that you remember that even in those persons who seem base there are still great possibilities. Perfectly consistent with this is also a special duty, which, whilst all of you heartily recognise it, still greatly calls for thought and prayer and spiritual effort,—*love the brotherhood.* Then, proceeding to another class of obligations,—as regards authority over you, your supreme duty, as you well know, is with holy, loving reverence to *fear God;* and with that duty naturally associates itself, when the subject is rightly understood, another, which some of you perhaps may have almost deemed inconsistent with your relation to God. It is His will, as you have just been told (vv. 14, 15), that you should respect and obey magistrates; wherefore, because ye fear God, *honour the king.*" It is possible that, as Peter wrote the last two precepts, Prov. xxiv. 21 was floating before his mind.

The fact that the aorist imperative occurs in the first of the four precepts, and the present imperative in all the others, arrests attention. Alford suggests that the first really stands by itself, as the sum of the exhortations, the other three being an expansion of it; thus, "Give to all their due honour,—to the brotherhood by loving them,—to God by fearing Him,—to the king by honouring him." This view is open to serious objections. (1) It is at the least doubtful whether it fairly satisfies the requirements of exegesis, as regards the relation of the verse to what precedes, and the relation of the several precepts to each other. (2) From *πάντας* it excludes a vast multitude whom naturally one quite decidedly expects to find included under the word, that great proportion of the human race who are unconverted. (3) Such a mode of expression, in which God and His creatures are gathered up under one term, *πάντας*, seems utterly alien from the profoundly reverential mode of speaking found everywhere in Scripture regarding God. The true explanation of the difference of tense between the first precept and the others is perhaps somewhat as follows. All four precepts relate to duties of a continued kind, and thus might fittingly take the present imperative. In introducing the series, however, and this with the injunction of a duty respecting which he had reason to believe some of his readers entertained grave misconceptions, the apostle naturally expresses himself in the somewhat more pointed and impassioned form afforded by the aorist imperative,—which, strictly interpreted, calls for a vigorous effort to *begin* "honouring all men." Being in the introductory precept of a group, all the members of which from the course of thought are seen to be closely related to each other, this aorist imperative is felt to give of itself a vigorous tone to the whole body of injunctions; and, accordingly, in those precepts that follow, the apostle naturally enough falls into the other tense, which brings out the continuousness of the obligation.—*Ἀδελφότης*, found in N. T. only here and in v. 9, has in both passages the collective meaning which, in words

of this kind, readily springs out of the original abstract sense, just as in English with the equivalent term "brotherhood," and many others; cf. ἱεράτευμα (vv. 5, 9).

Vv. 18–25. *On the duty of servants to obey their masters.*

Carrying forward his series of exhortations to duties arising out of special relations, the apostle proceeds now to the duty of servants to their masters. The fact that the construction in ver. 18 is not by a main verb, but by a participle, shows (see discussion of the construction below, in note on the verse) how close in the writer's mind was the connection between this section and the preceding,—specially with ὑποτάγητε (ver. 13). This grammatical dependence of the passage on ver. 13 plainly makes highly probable what has in previous notes been suggested, that by ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις in that verse is intended, not civil government alone, but generally such institutions—springing indeed out of the needs of that social life to which God has called man, but in their form determined by man himself—as involve some measure of subjection of one to another.

The word οἰκέται, "domestics," employed by the apostle in the 18th verse (cf. Luke xvi. 13; Acts x. 7; and see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 9), is not absolutely limited in usage to slaves, and is perhaps purposely used here in place of δοῦλοι, in order to include the freedmen and freedwomen, of whom in large households there were often considerable numbers acting in various capacities as servants. Still undoubtedly, both from the predominant use of the word,—so decidedly predominant that *e.g.* in Esdr. iii. 19 οἰκέτης is placed in direct antithesis to ἐλεύθερος,—and from what we know of the arrangements of social life among those to whom the Epistle was written, by far the most of the persons here addressed were slaves. Here, accordingly,—just as in the previous section regarding obedience to magistrates, where, in the first

instance, the precept enjoined obedience to Nero,—we have an extreme case. The slavery which existed everywhere throughout the Roman Empire was of a most oppressive character. Kind and considerate masters were no doubt to be found; but the nature of the system permitted the grossest cruelties, and, as always in such cases, selfishness and brutality often took advantage of the permission. Slaves had practically no legal rights, the law holding them *pro nullis, pro mortuis, pro quadrupedibus.* In persons thus situated who became Christians it was obviously natural in the highest degree that the assurance of their freedom in Christ would lead to such thoughts as these: "Can it possibly be that I, Christ's freedman, a citizen of the heavenly kingdom, a child of God, am to remain the bondman of this heathen, himself a slave of Satan?" Or, supposing the master to be a Christian, the slave's thought would naturally be, "Since he and I are brethren, it cannot be that in any sense I should continue his bondman, and therefore, even if he fail to see his duty in the matter, I have a right to assert my freedom and leave him, or, should I remain in his house, claim in everything the equality of a brother."

The apostle's teaching on the subject is the same as that which he had given respecting obedience to magistrates: "Be subject, and this not merely through fear of punishment, but for conscience' sake. Your obligation, too, is not dependent on the treatment which you receive: to harsh no less than to kind masters give obedience,—remembering, indeed, that it is in your demeanour under cruel dealing, in your maintenance of respectfulness and patience towards exacting and oppressive masters, that the distinctively *Christian* character which is acceptable in the sight of God is especially shown." Such is the apostle's exhortation. Similar teaching is found also in all the references made by Paul to the subject, which are numerous,—slaves evidently forming a large proportion everywhere of the members of the primitive Church: cf. Eph. vi. 5–8; Col. iii. 22–25; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2. A most striking

practical application of the principle enunciated, too, was given by Paul in sending back the fugitive slave Onesimus to his former master Philemon. The same doctrine with regard to the duty of slaves was faithfully maintained by the Church also after the death of the apostles. In *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, iv. 11, we have the injunction, ὑμεῖς δὲ, δοῦλοι, ὑποταγήσεσθε τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν ὡς τύπῳ Θεοῦ ἐν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ φόβῳ. Christianity was assuredly to be "the world-wide revolutionist of the ages" (Lillie), overthrowing all the strongholds of Satan, and among them the awful iniquity of slavery; but this was to be accomplished, not by convulsion, but through the gradual working of principles. It was not the will of Christ that there should be household rebellions, or servile wars, or general social chaos. "Nothing indeed marks the divine character of the gospel more than its perfect freedom from any appeal to the spirit of political revolution. The Founder of Christianity and His apostles were surrounded by everything which could tempt human reformers to enter on revolutionary courses. . . . Nevertheless our Lord and His apostles said not a word against the powers and institutions of that evil world. Their attitude towards them was that of deep spiritual hostility, and of entire political submission" (Goldwin Smith, quoted by Salmond).

The apostle, dwelling specially on patience under wrong, supports his exhortation by the example of the Saviour (vv. 21–23); and, having touched on this, rests lovingly and expatiates for a little, as every Christian heart does when the sufferings of Christ come before it, on their atoning purpose and power (vv. 24, 25). For a fuller analysis of this latter part of the section, see below, note on ver. 22.

Ver. 18. The participial construction has been explained in various ways,—some expositors supposing that here, and in several other passages, the participle has in itself the force of an imperative (on which view cf. note on ἔχοντες, ver. 12),—others supplying the imperative of the substantive verb, some

of them in the second person, others in the third. None of these methods, however, is necessary, or altogether natural. The fact that both in this section and in the next (iii. 1 foll.) the special duty enjoined is subjection, and that both sections are introduced by the participle of that same verb of which the imperative is given in ver. 13, naturally leads a reader to think that in the apostle's mind the same general exhortation was being carried forward with different special references. Through obvious correlation with the precept of iii. 1, again, that of iii. 7, though not enjoining subjection, is felt still to belong to the same series; and, falling under the more general exhortation of ii. 11, 12, which leads into the ὑποτάγητε of ver. 13, it also has a participial form. Still further, through this wider reference of iii. 7, the participial construction is carried forward into the quite general exhortation of iii. 8. Granting therefore that the structure of modern languages may render it desirable, for the sake of clearness, to make the sections grammatically distinct, introducing each by an imperative of its own; yet the exhortation seems plainly to have taken in the writer's mind the form of one great precept, branching out by means of participles in various directions,—the earlier sections standing attached closely to ὑποτάγητε of ver. 13 (still felt by a reader to be the main verb of the paragraph, notwithstanding the group of short imperative clauses in ver. 17), the later sections, in a way hardly recognised by rigid grammatical law, yet quite natural and intelligible, to the general call to holiness implied in ὑποτάγητε and distinctly given in vv. 11, 12.

Οἱ οἰκέται is naturally taken with the force of a vocative, according to a use of the nominative with the article which is common in N. T., and is found sometimes also in classical writers, though probably rather a colloquialism: cf. Winer, p. 227; A. Buttmann, p. 140. Our nearest idiomatic representative of the article thus used is perhaps the pronoun of the second person joined to a word of address, as here "Ye servants."—In ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ we have the atmosphere—the

spirit—of the enjoined subjection. Some have taken φόβος here to mean "fear of God," or "of Christ," referring in support of this view to Eph. v. 21; Jude 23. In the former of these passages, however, Χριστοῦ is expressed, the precept given, moreover, not being at all closely similar to the present; and in the passage in Jude the meaning of the words ἐν φόβῳ does not seem to be "in the fear of God." Whilst, of course, in a Christian the fear of God will always be the grand influence constraining to the cherishing of any spirit or the following of any course which God enjoins, the immediate reference of φόβος in our passage seems clearly to be to fear of the master; and really analogous passages are Rom. xiii. 7; Eph. v. 33. The best rendering of φόβος as thus used is probably "reverence." However little there may often be in a master's character to awaken or sustain the sentiment of reverence, still the relation in which he stands to his servants is one legitimately calling on them to cherish this sentiment; and their duty is to regard him as being their master through an arrangement of the Providence of Him who is always and infinitely worthy of reverence. The practical outcome of this "reverence" for a master will be "fear" of neglecting duty in any respect, and anxious solicitude to be free from all grounds of just reproach. These two thoughts, standing in such close connection with each other, may reasonably be supposed to have been both before the apostle's mind in writing φόβῳ. In a parallel passage on the duty of slaves, Eph. vi. 5, we have the yet stronger expression for "fear" employed, μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου (cf. Phil. ii. 12; 2 Cor. vii. 15), and also an explicit statement of the principle underlying the enjoined φόβος, which at once leads us to a correct apprehension of its nature, ὑπακούετε . . . ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ.—Παντί, whilst best translated "all," is strictly "every," "every kind of," *i.e.* practically, "full and abiding reverence and solicitude;" cf. i. 24, note.

Ἀγαθοῖς here means obviously "good" as regarded from a servant's point of view,—*i.e.* "kind:" cf. Tit. ii. 5; 1 Thess.

iii. 6.—Of ἐπιεικέσιν the precise force appears to be "considerate and forbearing:" cf. Phil. iv. 5; Acts xxiv. 4, and see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 43. Philo (*Mund. Opif.*, Mang. 25) has the combination ἐπιείκεια καὶ πραότης, qualities which, he says, are seen τῶν παθῶν ἡμερωθέντων.—Σκολιός in its metaphorical use presents an image which is universally understood. Employed first of paths, as in LXX., Prov. ii. 15, ὧν αἱ τρίβοι σκολιαί, it connects itself also readily with the persons themselves who walk in the crooked paths, as Deut. xxxii. 5; Phil. ii. 15, γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη, "a generation who—instead of having a character of rectitude, straightness in the line of the divine will—are in all things crooked and contorted." As employed in the present passage with reference to masters, and opposed to "good and considerate," we may perhaps—remembering that both classes of masters were no doubt in most cases heathen, and that not improbably therefore the apostle was thinking of varieties of natural temperament, at least as much as of character based on principle—take the precise application of the image to be somewhat like that of the similar figure in our own colloquial adjective "cross,"—much stronger, however, in its suggestion of harshness than "cross." A δεσπότης σκολιός is one whom his servants find it almost impossible to please, because, when they have worked along the line which from his former utterances seemed likely to satisfy him, they find always that his likings have twisted themselves into a new direction. Caprice, exactingness, and harshness seem all implied in the epithet. "Perverse," or the old word "froward," represents the image or one similar, but "harsh" is perhaps the best rendering.

Ver. 19. In this and the following verses the apostle dwells on the relation of servants to δεσπόται σκολιοί, as being that in which the temptation to rebellious self-assertion was greatest, and in which therefore the ennobling power of Christian principle could specially reveal itself. It appears, too, from the line which his observations take, that, as regarded

"being subject" to their masters, whilst, of course, he had before his thoughts the faithful performance of ordinary daily duty, yet with respect to the case of those servants who had harsh masters, his mind turned specially, as was natural, to their demeanour under undeserved chiding or chastisement. Their duty in such trying circumstances, he would have them clearly see, was to resist stedfastly the strong temptation to sullenness or passion or disrespectful conduct; "for this is acceptable, — namely, if a man for consciousness of God patiently endures troubles, suffering unjustly."

According to a familiar N. T. usage, the demonstrative as formal subject is employed to point to a coming clause, which is the real subject. This clause might have been in the infinitive, but—also according to a common N. T. construction —is thrown into another form introduced by a conjunction; cf. Winer, p. 403.—The use of the neuter of the pronoun in τοῦτο χάρις (ἐστί) here and in the next verse is in itself natural, and similar constructions are found occasionally in Greek writers of all ages. On the whole, however, it accords with the idiom of modern rather than with that of the classical languages, a pronominal subject being in these, as a rule, made to agree in gender with the predicate: cf. John iii. 19, xvii. 3, and see Winer, p. 650; A. Buttmann, p. 128. In the present passage the Vulgate rendering is, *hæc* est gratia.—With regard to χάρις here a natural thought is that it is = χάρισμα (1 Cor. vii. 7), "a gift from God's grace," a spiritual beauty which proves the working of grace on the soul. In ver. 20, however, the apostle, for clearness and impressiveness, fills up the expression with the words παρὰ Θεῷ, "in God's sight;" instead of which, supposing χάρις to have been in the writer's mind equivalent to χάρισμα, one would have expected rather παρὰ Θεοῦ, "from God" (cf. ἐκ Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. vii. 7). Looking at the cast of the thought in vv. 19, 20, it seems by far most probable that χάρις is used in the same way as in Luke vi. 32, 33, "If ye love them that love you, if ye do good to them that do good to you, ποία ὑμῖν

χάρις ἐστίν;" and indeed it is difficult to resist the impression that that saying of our Lord was present to the apostle's mind. Now the parallel passage, Matt. v. 46, has τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε (cf. also ver. 35 in Luke),—which shows that χάρις must have some such force as "approving recognition," a sense of the word tending towards, but not identical with, that which it bears in the familiar expression χάριν ἔχειν, "to thank." Compare also the Homily formerly known as Ep. ii. of Clem. Rom. § 13, and Ignat. *Polyc.* § 2, the former being a free citation of the passage just quoted from Luke, and the other an obvious imitation. In our present passage we may take τοῦτο χάρις as a condensed mode of expression, "this is (means, certainly brings) approving recognition;" exactly as in Phil. i. 22, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου, "this is (means, brings) fruit of labour." It does not seem needful to go farther, and assume that the apostle uses χάρις directly in the sense of "an acceptable act or course of conduct." It suffices that practically, according to the explanation just given, τοῦτο χάρις is equivalent to τοῦτο εὐάρεστόν (or ἀπόδεκτόν) ἐστιν (cf. Col. iii. 20; 1 Tim. ii. 3).

In the word συνείδησις the preposition of the compound points to the reflective action of the mind, the mind's conference, so to speak, with itself. The special reference of the word therefore, as distinguished from γνῶσις, is to the mind's acquaintance with itself, particularly its acquaintance with what has been written by God on the tablets of the heart regarding Himself and regarding right and wrong, and with the dealings of the soul in relation to right and wrong. In the great majority of the cases of its occurrence in N. T., the word is used either absolutely or with a possessive genitive, and has precisely the force of our English "conscience," in the free popular use of that word. In only one other passage where the reading is certain, besides the present, is it construed with a genitive of object,—viz. Heb. x. 2, συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν, "conscience, or consciousness, of sins." In 1 Cor. viii. 7, συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου, "consciousness of the idol," *i.e.*

seemingly, consciousness of it as a kind of mind-haunting presence, *συνηθείᾳ* appears to have better authority than *συνειδήσει*. In the place now before us, *συνείδησις Θεοῦ* cannot well mean anything else than "consciousness of God," —knowledge of God and of His relations to us, and this present in consciousness, remembered, thought of, and thus influential over the affections and conduct. This is, no doubt, what is intended by the somewhat peculiar phrase employed by both A. and R. E. V., "conscience toward God." —*Λύπας*—like "griefs" often in the older English, and sometimes still—has, as occasionally, the force of "troubles, vexations, *causes* of grief" (so Philo, *Mund. Opif.*, Mang. p. 40). Our word "grievances" nearly corresponds to this use,—only that, as commonly employed, it suggests in itself blame to some one, which *λύπαι* does not do. The verb *ὑποφέρειν*, which sometimes is no more than simply "to undergo," indicating in itself nothing as to the spirit of the sufferer (2 Tim. iii. 11), is evidently to be taken here (as in 1 Cor. x. 13), according to a natural tendency of words of this class in all languages, precisely with the force of *ὑπομένειν* of the next verse, "to bear with patience, with holy resolution."—The adverb *ἀδίκως* is placed at the end of the clause with marked emphasis, the undeservedness of harsh treatment being, as is illustrated in the following verse, the test of the honourableness of the suffering, and of its claim to be a brightener of Christian hope.

Ver. 20. "To bear punishment quietly and submissively, if one has done wrong, is no doubt a creditable thing as compared with accepting the chastisement in a sullen spirit, or with rudeness and rebellion; but what kind of (*ποῖον*) credit or glory is this in the eyes of any self-respecting man, not to say a Christian! (cf. Luke vi. 32–34). On the other hand, if a man who does well,—who faithfully executes the charge entrusted to him,—and who for that very well-doing suffers through the caprice or brutality of his master, bears this gross injustice patiently, this is acceptable in God's sight."

The two present participles *ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι* come in naturally here, in place of what, looking simply at the order of time, might have been expected, *ἁμαρτήσαντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι*. This latter form would have been in place, had isolated acts of wrong-doing and of consequent punishment been before the apostle's mind; but the question in hand being one of *character*, he has the present participle of both verbs, representing the case as one of continuance, a *course* of wrong-doing and receiving chastisement. Similarly in the other clause with *ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες*. The future *ὑπομενεῖτε*, used in both clauses, answers to the same mode of representation: "if, to one looking down your lives from the present moment, the field of vision shall be found occupied with wrong-doing and punishment," or, in the other case, "with well-doing and suffering for it."—*Κολαφίζειν*, perfectly rendered by our English "buffet," sets before us primarily what was no doubt often the punishment of slaves for the lighter class of misdemeanours, a smart stroke of the hand on the cheek, and then, according to the secondary use of the word, rough handling generally: cf. Matt. xxvi. 67; 1 Cor. iv. 11.—In the Gospels the verb *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* follows the special sense of *ἀγαθός* exemplified in ver. 18,—meaning "to do good, to act beneficently:" see Mark iii. 4; Luke vi. 9, 33, 35. In the Epistles (3 John 11, and several times in Peter) it follows the general sense of the adjective,—"to do well, act rightly." Similarly the nouns *ἀγαθοποιία* and *ἀγαθοποιός* are used by Peter, who alone has them, with the sense respectively of "well-doing" and "well-doer:" see iv. 19, ii. 14.—The combination *ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες* might quite fairly mean "doing well and yet (simply as a matter of fact, without the suggestion of any connection of cause and effect) suffering;" but the antithesis *ἁμαρτάνοντες καὶ κολαφιζόμενοι*, where manifestly a causal connection is intended, makes it in a high degree likely that here also this was in the writer's thoughts,—"doing well and suffering *for it*." It accords with universal experience that a brutal, low-

minded master, irritated by that feeling of moral inferiority which was awakened in him by the sight of the virtuous conduct of his slave, might in many cases subject the slave to cruel treatment, professedly perhaps for some pretended fault, but really, as the slave himself, and everybody around knew, because of the well-doing.—As to *τοῦτο χάρις*, see note on ver. 19; and on *παρὰ Θεῷ*, in its present connection, cf. Luke ii. 52.

Ver. 21. "Patient endurance of wrong, I say, is acceptable in God's sight, for this is one most important element of that experience to which you were summoned by Him when He called you in conversion. You cannot doubt this, because, as you know (*ὅτι*, as often, of evidence, rather than of strict causality), Jesus also, your Forerunner, suffered for you, leaving you an example to the intent that you might follow His footsteps, — and this alike as regards not shrinking from suffering which by God's appointment comes to you in the path of your duty, and as regards the mode of bearing the suffering."

Τοῦτο here, as is evident from the line of thought, has substantially the same reference as in *τοῦτο χάρις* immediately preceding; only the mind naturally takes it now with a general reference, as pointing to patient endurance of wrong of any kind. The divine "call," being to the exhibition of a certain spiritual excellence, includes, of course, also a call to the field in which alone that excellence can be shown—a call, that is to say, to carry out Christian principles manfully in the face of a world which hates Christ, and to accept the sufferings which the world's hostility may inflict; cf. John xv. 18–21. On nothing did our Lord in His personal teaching lay more stress than on the fact that the very calling to be a disciple involves a calling to take up the cross and follow Him; cf. Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24; Luke xiv. 27.—The verb *πάσχειν*, simply by itself, appears to have been from a very early time in frequent use among Christians as a summary term for the Lord's expiatory sufferings generally,

including along with His death—to which, of course, the word mainly pointed—also the agony in the garden, and the mockeries and brutalities of the trial (*e.g.* cf. Acts i. 3; Heb. xiii. 12),—the usage being founded indeed on His own words spoken on the evening before His crucifixion (Luke xxii. 15).

In the connection of this verse with the preceding, *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* is naturally taken as meant to remind the readers of the personal blamelessness of the Saviour, His sufferings being purely vicarious; and to this thought *καί* before *Χριστός* points forward, presenting the parallelism between the case of the Lord and that of those slaves just spoken of who suffered for well-doing,—"for Christ also suffered, though Himself innocent, yea, suffered for well-doing." At the same time the words set forth prominently the grand motive which impels Christians to holy obedience (2 Cor. v. 14, 15)—specially, in the connection, to holy obedience in the way of patience under trial: "If He suffered for you, you will not shrink from suffering which He sends, and which is calculated, through your spiritual growth under it, to redound to His praise."—In hearing the English expression "suffered for you," we feel that, as regards the sense of the preposition "for," the ideas of "on behalf of," and "in room of," both pass before us; and similarly, when we remember the familiarity to the N. T. writers of the doctrine that Christ gave Himself as a ransom for sinners, it seems probable that, where used as here, *ὑπέρ*, strictly "on behalf of," had also in their minds the substitutionary reference; cf. Winer, p. 479. In the majority of instances, as in the present, there is nothing in the context decisive on this point, and therefore the statement made in such passages cannot with safety be taken as beyond question equivalent to those in which the preposition is *ἀντί* (as Matt. xx. 28); but certainly, at all events, in 2 Cor. v. 14, to give validity to the apostle's argument, *ὑπὲρ πάντων*, it would seem, *must* mean "instead of all."

The prominent position of ὑμῖν in its clause plainly gives to it a strong emphasis, which a reader feels also to be somewhat added to by the fact that the word immediately follows ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The force is perhaps something like this, "to all His people, doubtless, but to you, in your peculiar circumstances, with special fulness and exactness, leaving an example."—The enlarged form ὑπολιμπάνω, for ὑπολείπω, occurs here only in N. T. The exact time and shade of thought probably intended by the apostle in the participle ὑπολιμπάνων are indicated by Bengel with his characteristic terseness,—*in abitu ad Patrem.*—Ὑπογραμμός, here only in N. T., was primarily used for a writing or drawing copy, put before pupils by their teachers (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 8. 50), and then naturally for the rule implied in a prescribed copy, or, as here, simply for an example (= ὑπόδειγμα, John xiii. 15; Jas. v. 10); cf. 2 Macc. ii. 28; Clem. Rom. §§ 5, 16, 33; Polyc. § 8. The fact that immediately, in the clause introduced by ἵνα, Peter passes into the quite different figure of following the footsteps of a leader, seems to show that the image in the word ὑπογραμμός was not vividly, or perhaps not at all, present to his mind.

In one minute feature the beautiful and instructive picture given us in the last clause of this verse, of the Lord's people following their divine Forerunner down into the valley of humiliation, may be differently conceived. The verb ἐπακολουθεῖν being regularly construed with a dative (1 Tim. v. 10, 24), the meaning may be "Follow His footsteps" as guides; or, τοῖς ἴχνεσιν being used in N. T. in the sense of "*in* the footsteps" (Rom. iv. 12 with στοιχεῖν, and 2 Cor. xii. 18 with περιπατεῖν), it may be "Follow (Him, treading) in His footsteps." Striking and vivid as this latter representation is, yet perhaps the former construction is to be preferred, as being the more obvious.—Some expositors would give to ἐπακολουθεῖν here an intensive force, translating thus, "that ye may follow closely (or earnestly)." That quite naturally, in accordance with its use to indicate motion towards and to

mark addition, the preposition ἐπί in composition does sometimes give greater intensity to the signification of the word with which it is compounded, is certain,—the best illustration of this power in the N. T. being perhaps in ἐπιγινώσκειν as contrasted with the simple γινώσκειν (*e.g.* 1 Cor. xiii. 12). The particular verb now before us, too, is in 1 Tim. v. 10 rendered both by A. and R. E. V. "to follow diligently," which is perfectly suitable there, as it would be here also. On the other hand, the verb, in the only other two places where it occurs in N. T., Mark xvi. 20, 1 Tim. v. 24, is employed—as in any language compounds which were originally strengthening are apt to be, when they come into frequent use—in a sense not appreciably different from that of the simple verb. It may be doubted, therefore, whether in any of the places a special force was intended in the use of the compound.

Vv. 22–25. We have now a series of relative clauses in which, in the first place (vv. 22, 23), the relevancy of an appeal to the Saviour's example, in consequence of the parallelism of the cases—already indicated in a summary way in the words ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν—is fully and formally set forth: (α) He was absolutely innocent (ver. 22); yet (β) He suffered, and in His sufferings He showed perfect meekness and patience (ver. 23). Then, in the second place, the apostle proceeds to expand yet further the ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, reminding his readers that, whilst Christ's sufferings have an aspect of example, they bring before us also the expiation of our sin, and thus present to us the most powerful motives to follow the example of the Lord's patience and holy beauty of character: (γ) He died for our sins, to the intent that we might live to holiness (ver. 24, down to the word ζήσωμεν); and (δ) by His wounds His people have, in fact, been spiritually healed (ver. 24, last clause, and ver. 25). Whilst in nowise rhetorically wrought up, but perfectly simple and natural in structure, this passage must be felt by every attentive reader to be one of singular beauty and impressiveness.

Ver. 22. Throughout the whole passage, vv. 22–25, the apostle's mind is plainly dwelling much on the great prediction of Messiah as a Sufferer, which is contained in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah. Ver. 22 is a quotation of the latter part of the 9th verse of that chapter, varying from the LXX. rendering, as it stands in Codex A, only by the substitution of *ἁμαρτίαν* for *ἀνομίαν*. The passage, as here used by the apostle, is evidently one of the highest interest and importance, in its connection with the great apologetic argument based on the perfection of the character of Christ. Peter, one of the very inmost circle of those who were privileged to enjoy the companionship of the Lord, makes the prophet's words his own, and thus most plainly sets to his seal that they are true to the very letter. He testifies that in Jesus, as seen by him for years in public and in private, amid most varied circumstances,—tested by the special temptations connected with great popularity, and by the special temptations connected with bitter opposition,—there was absolute spotlessness of character. He was pure in conduct, "doing no sin;" and in speech—notwithstanding innumerable snares laid for Him, and the closest listening of many who were eager to find Him in fault (this is pointed to by the word *εὑρέθη*)—there was absolute freedom from "guile," — from duplicity, evasion, falsehood in any form,—so that He approved Himself the "perfect man" who "offendeth not in word" (Jas. iii. 2). Precisely similar testimony regarding the Lord's character to that which is borne here by Peter is given also, it will be remembered, by another of the specially privileged three apostles—"In Him is no sin" (1 John iii. 5).—In the use of the aorists *ἐποίησεν* and *εὑρέθη* the Lord's life is looked at, not in its extension and variety, but as a unity, constituting, so to speak, a point in history; cf. John xvii. 4, *ἐδόξασα*. This is in itself striking, as showing that moral oneness, as it stood out before Peter's memory, of the eminently full and varied life of the Lord, which made him feel it quite natural to employ for himself the aorists of the LXX. The life seemed

to him to form one great act of holiness. In the next verse, no less naturally, the many scenes and varied forms in which Christ was exposed to "the contradiction of sinners" come up to the apostle's thoughts, and thus we have imperfects. —On the frequent use in N. T., in place of the simple substantive verb, of the verb *εὑρίσκεσθαι*, by which a lively picture of seekers and finders is presented to view, cf. Winer, p. 769.

Ver. 23. It can hardly be doubted, looking at the abundant use of Isa. liii. in the context, that in this verse, whilst not quoting but expanding, the apostle had in his mind the 7th verse of that chapter, which describes Messiah as under oppression "opening not His mouth, as a sheep before her shearers is dumb."—The present participles point us to the many occasions on which He was reviled, as a Sabbath-breaker, a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a blasphemer, a man in league with Satan, and the like, and to the various forms and stages of His sufferings; under all of which, as the imperfects tell us, He displayed an absolute freedom from the spirit of revenge. The stern warnings which He often gave to the careless and hostile were manifestly of a nature totally distinct from revilings or utterances of revenge, and indeed directly opposed, being spoken with deep solemnity and deep sorrow, and in the spirit of yearning love. In *λοιδορούμενος*, followed by *πάσχων*, we have evidently an advance from hatred shown in words to hatred shown in action, and similarly with *ἀντελοιδόρει* and *ἠπείλει*,—*ἀπειλεῖν* being the threatening of retaliatory action.—As to the force of *δέ* in a sentence of this kind—not, strictly speaking, standing in correspondence with the previous *οὐκ*, as *ἀλλά* would have done, but, as by a kind of afterthought, introducing a new statement on the subject in a positive form, and answering, therefore, to some such English expression as "yea, rather," or "on the contrary"—see Winer, p. 551, and Alford's note on Heb. ii. 6; and cf. Acts xii. 9, 14; Heb. ii. 9.

Whilst the general sense of the second part of the verse is

obvious, yet the precise thought which was present to the apostle's mind in writing *παρεδίδου* is not altogether clear. Considering the frequent intransitive or reflexive use of many verbs properly transitive (*ἄγειν, ἐπιστρέφειν κτλ.*),—the naturalness of this use in such verbs as *παραδιδόναι*, as illustrated by the similar use of "yield" and "surrender" in English,—and the actual reflexive use of this very verb now and again in the LXX. (Isa. xlvii. 3, and, as read in Codex A, Josh. xi. 19), and once, perhaps, in N. T. (Mark iv. 29), one may quite fairly take the force of the word to be reflexive here, and translate thus, "committed Himself." It must be acknowledged, however, that, for a word which occurs very many times in N. T., the authority supporting this reflexive use is exceedingly scanty; and even in the one place in Mark some excellent interpreters, as Meyer, Bleek, and the Revisers of the E. V., give the verb a transitive force, "to allow." In our present passage, also, many scholars hold it to be transitive, the object in the writer's mind being an unemphatic "it," which, as usual in such cases, is omitted. This "it" may represent "His cause,"—an object suggested by the scope of the clause, and specially by *τῷ κρίνοντι*. Both the A. and R. E. V., while putting "committed Himself" in the text, have in the margin, as an alternative, "committed His cause." More natural, perhaps, than either is the view that the understood "it" designates *τὸ λοιδορεῖσθαι καὶ τὸ πάσχειν*, taken out of the participles: Jesus did not deal with this Himself in the way of repaying it by counter revilings and threats, but gave it all over into the hands of the Righteous Judge. Others, instead of "it," prefer the slightly more remote, and thus not quite so easy, supplement "them," *i.e.* those who reviled Him and inflicted the sufferings. Short discussions regarding the use of *παρεδίδου* in this passage will be found in Winer, p. 738, and A. Buttmann, p. 145. The sense of the statement is obviously in substance very nearly the same, on any view as to the exact nature of the construction,—"From the midst of the cruelties and ribaldries of men Jesus always looked away to heaven,

and gave over the whole matter to Him who sees all actions and all hearts, and who alike on Him and on His foes would give righteous judgement." The absolutely pure, unrevengeful, loving spirit of this "committing to God" is illustrated by the prayer offered from the cross.—With *τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως*, cf. i. 17, *τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα*. The Vulgate has here the singular rendering "tradebat autem judicanti se injuste;" as if reading *ἀδίκως*, and taking the reference to be to the Lord's meek surrender of Himself to the unjust judge Caiaphas or Pilate. This reading has no Greek authority, and is self-condemned, because the imperfect *παρεδίδου* (*tradebat*) plainly points, like *οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει* and *οὐκ ἠπείλει*, to the Lord's conduct, not exclusively at the trial and crucifixion, but throughout His whole ministry. This mistranslation is interesting chiefly as being one specialty of the Vulgate, which even Roman Catholic scholars cannot agree to defend,—Estius, for example, making the admission that "librariorum incuria in Codicibus Latinis legitur *injuste* pro *juste*."

Ver. 24. "In the sufferings of Christ we have set before us, not merely a perfect example of the meek endurance of wrong, but also the most powerful motive to follow this example, because His sufferings and death were for the expiation of our sins, and this to the intent that, saved thereby, we should live to holiness."

With respect to the exact form of the apostle's thought in the first clause of this verse, different views are possible. In connection with sacrifice, the verb *ἀναφέρειν* is used by the Hellenistic writers in two shades of meaning—(1) "to offer, present," and this either with mention of the altar (*ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον*), as Jas. ii. 21, Gen. viii. 20, or without such mention, as ver. 5 of this chapter, Judg. xi. 31; (2) "to bear," said of the victim on whose head sin is laid, as Heb. ix. 28; Isa. liii. 11, 12,—this latter use of the verb being in accordance with an occasional classical use, "to sustain, bear," wars, or perils, or troubles of any kind (cf. Thucyd. iii. 38, *κινδύνους*; Polyb. i. 36. 3, *φθόνους*). The fact that

ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον stands in our present passage has led Luther, Lechler, and one or two other expositors—taking these words as answering to ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον—to think that here our Lord is said to have, as a Priest, "offered our sins in His body on the tree,"—our sins being viewed as in the eye of divine justice so identified with Christ that in His death judgement came down upon them, or, so to speak, they were consumed on the altar of the cross by the fire of God. But this is a mode of representation for which there seems to be no Scripture analogy; and ξύλον, as employed in our passage (on which see below), is not fitted to suggest the idea of an altar, but only of an instrument for the execution of a capital sentence. Others, putting aside the special sacrificial uses of ἀναφέρειν, revert to its primary sense (as in Matt. xvii. 1), regarding the apostle's thought to be that Jesus carried our sins as a burden laid upon Him all through the journey of His earthly life, and up to the tree; some thinking also that perhaps by ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον is meant to be suggested some such idea as that our sins were carried by the Saviour to the tree to be nailed there, that they might oppress no more (cf. Col. ii. 14).

On the whole, the most natural and satisfactory interpretation appears to be that which is given by both A. and R. E. V., —"bore our sins on (upon) the tree." A really decisive argument with regard to the sense in which the apostle uses ἀνήνεγκεν seems to lie in the fact that he is here expanding a statement of Isaiah, and cannot well be thought to employ the central word of the statement in a different sense from the prophet. It cannot, indeed, be demonstrated that when Peter wrote τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν, he was thinking of Isaiah's αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν (liii. 12), with the order of words perhaps affected by the chiming in his memory also of the closing statement of the verse immediately preceding, τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει; but when we compare the passages, and bear in mind that, according to distinct evidence afforded by the context immediately

preceding and immediately following, the 53rd chapter of Isaiah was much before the apostle's mind throughout the section, there certainly seems to be an exceedingly high probability that the clause under consideration is to be deemed an expansion of Isaiah's words. Now, beyond reasonable question, the use of *ἀνήνεγκεν* in the LXX. rendering of the passage of Isaiah is in the sense of "bore" as a sacrificial victim, bore for expiation. With the view that this is also the sense in which Peter uses it, the added words *ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ* accord well, better, perhaps, than with any of the other interpretations; for by the preposition *ἐν* the field or sphere of the *ἀνήνεγκεν* is set forth, which fits perfectly with a simple reference to Christ's "bearing our sins" in His propitiatory sufferings (cf. Col. i. 22). In *ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον* again there does not really lie any obstacle to our accepting this view of the meaning; for, according to a tendency seen perhaps in all languages, *ἐπί* with the accusative, like several other prepositions of motion, is in N. T. often construed with verbs which do not in themselves imply motion,—the thought of prior motion being easily supplied by the mind; cf. chap. iv. 14; Matt. xviii. 12; Mark iv. 38; Rev. v. 1. Thus the force of the expression is quite adequately given by the R. E. V. when for "on" of the rendering of the A. V. "bare our sins in His own body on the tree," it substitutes the preposition of motion "upon,"—this "upon" suggesting "when lifted upon." It does not appear therefore to be at all needful to resort, with some scholars, to the supposition that whilst the ruling sense of *ἀνήνεγκεν* in the passage is "bore" as Propitiation, the idea of motion also is to be directly derived from the verb taken in its primary sense,—thus, "who bore our sins in His body to the tree, and as a victim bore them on it." No inartificial writer, such as our apostle, would be in the least likely to use one word to express two thoughts so considerably divergent from each other as "carried up" and "bore as a victim;" and no reader would ever naturally understand the word to be thus used.

The emphasis given by *αὐτός* appears to express some such thought as this—"Measureless as are such love and condescension, yet not through any subordinate agent, not through any arrangement apart from His own substitution for us, was our redemption wrought out, but He Himself bore our sins." The A.V. brings out a similar emphasis also in the words "in His own body;" but the meaning seems rather to be simply, as the R. V. has it, "in His body." Such evidence as is attainable appears to show that in N. T. the reflexive pronoun of the third person is almost always written fully *ἑαυτοῦ κτλ.*, and therefore that where, as here, the form *αυτοῦ* occurs, it is to be written with a *spiritus lenis*, *αὐτοῦ*; cf. Winer, p. 188; A. Buttmann, p. 111. Even with the reading *αὐτοῦ* a certain emphasis may be supposed (so Alford), because the pronoun might without any ambiguity have been omitted; but the great abundance of pronouns in the N. T. style, through Hebrew influence, makes it, to say the least, very doubtful whether the apostle wrote the word as anything more than a simple unemphatic possessive.

Whilst those sufferings of our Blessed Lord in His atoning work, which were specially of the *soul* (Matt. xxvi. 38, xxvii. 46), were, as an old writer quaintly says, "the soul of His sufferings," yet the *material* element in His Passion—the bodily anguish which He endured for us—is often and naturally prominent in references made to it; because all men can to some extent understand and feel the love which was thus displayed, while the unseen side of the sufferings is, from its nature, deeply mysterious. In the present connection the specification of the field or sphere of suffering by *ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ* can hardly but seem particularly natural, when we remember that the reference to the Lord's Passion is made in order to exhibit example and motive to slaves, who, many of them, had from day to day to endure cruel inflictions of bodily pain.—To the use in N. T. of the word *ξύλον*, "timber, log," for *σταυρός*, our English "tree," in its old wide signification—still seen in such compounds as "roof-

tree, cross-trees," etc.,—well answers. This use is not very common. Besides the present place, it is found in Acts v. 30, x. 39, xiii. 29; Gal. iii. 13,—the first two of these passages, it may be observed, occurring in addresses of Peter, and thus showing this mode of expression to be one familiar to him. This use of the word ξύλον sprang, as a comparison with each other of the passages cited distinctly shows, from the Jewish practice described in Deut. xxi. 22, 23. After the infliction of capital punishment according to the Hebrew mode, stoning, the bodies of the very worst of malefactors were suspended publicly on a tree or post; and when, under the administration of the Romans, crucifixion was introduced into Palestine, that form of punishment was regarded by the Jews as equivalent to an exposure of this kind,—an exposure which was held to be a public declaration that the curse of God had come down on a rebel against His law. The thought prominent in the mind of every Jewish Christian, therefore, when in speech or writing he employed this name ξύλον for the cross of Jesus, was of the sublime, immeasurable grace which led his Lord to be "made a curse for us," that He might "redeem us from the curse of the law" (Gal. iii. 13).

The apostle's exhibition in this verse of motive to holy obedience divides itself into two parts: (1) The statement that Jesus died for our sins,—the supreme ground of gratitude and love; (2) the statement of His purpose in dying for us, namely that, freed from sin's oppression, we might be holy, —from which plainly it immediately follows that earnest effort after holiness is the mode in which sincere and intelligent gratitude and love to Him will manifest themselves. The *sanctifying* purpose of the Lord in His giving Himself for us—often set forth in N. T., *e.g.* i. 18, 19; Gal. i. 4; Tit. ii. 14—is presented here under a form in which the Apostle Paul greatly delighted to look at it, the believer's death with relation to sin, and life with relation to God and His service; cf. especially Rom. vi. 2, 4, 11. The basis of this representation is the mystical union between Christ

and His people, according to which in His death we also died, so as to be no longer either under the condemnation of the law or under the dominion of sin, and in His resurrection we also rose with Him to enjoy a new life of peace and of holy beauty and energy, kindred to His. With the legal union before the eye of God, through which "there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," is inseparably associated a spiritual union, through which by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost we are sanctified.—The verb *ἀπογίνεσθαι*, here only in N. T., is employed by classical writers in the sense of "to part from, cease from connection with," and then also, by a euphemism familiar in all languages, "to depart this life, decease, die." The primary sense has been adopted here by some expositors; but that the secondary was that in the writer's mind, seems to be sufficiently clear from the antithesis with *ζήσωμεν*,—and also from the construction with the dative, the other naturally taking the genitive.

The dative joined here to *ἀπογενόμενοι* and *ζήσωμεν*—a kind of construction greatly favoured by Paul (Rom. xiv. 6–8, for example, affording abundant illustrations in connection with various verbs) — seems to fall under the general head of *dat. comm. et incomm.* Thus, here, whilst possibly all that was present in consciousness to the writer was this thought, "that, having become dead in reference to our sins, we might live in reference to righteousness," still really, behind this, there seems in the construction to lie something of personification,—our sins being tyrants, to whom now Christians, being dead, have ceased to be of service, whereas to righteousness, our new ruler, we do earnest service through the activity of life; cf. Winer, p. 263, and especially A. Buttmann, p. 178. By some interpreters the datives here have been taken as instrumental, giving the clause this force, "that, having in Christ died by our sins, we might live by His righteousness." The course of the apostle's thought, however, and the Pauline parallels, seem to show distinctly that, whilst the truth respecting the change of the believer's

legal relations to God is, from the nature of the case, *implied* in the clause, yet the aspect of the "dying and living" which is directly presented is ethical, and that thus the force of the datives is not "by" but "to."—Looking at the connection with each other of the clauses of the verse, we can hardly doubt that the article in *ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις* does not merely, as so often, answer practically to a possessive pronoun (fully "the sins which we all so well know of as ours"), but that in writing it the apostle was consciously reduplicating on *τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν* of the first clause,—the precise meaning accordingly being "the sins (spoken of)." Naturally, therefore, perhaps, in the antithesis *τῇ* before *δικαιοσύνῃ* also is not merely the mark of the abstract, but sets before us some such thought as "the righteousness (which belongs to life in Christ)."

The division of verses has not been satisfactorily made here. The last clause of the 24th ought to have begun the 25th; because it is not a mere epexegesis of the preceding statement, but presents a new thought, which, as *γάρ* shows, the 25th verse explains and justifies. This new thought—in advance of ver. 24, which has spoken of the gracious *purpose* of our Lord's sufferings—is that these sufferings have *actually saved* those to whom the apostle writes, inasmuch as they had become believers, and had thus passed within the sphere of the life-giving action of Christ's death. That we have here a distinct link in Peter's beautiful expansion of the *ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* of ver. 21, seems to be quite plainly intimated by the fact that, whilst quoting the last clause of Isa. liii. 5, he substitutes *οὗ* for *αὐτοῦ* of the LXX., thus constituting the statement a member of the series of relative clauses (vv. 22, 23, 24). The only other change is the substitution of the cheering form of direct address and assurance to the poor slaves, *ἰάθητε*, for *ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν*: "assuming that ye are sincere believers in Him, then I tell you that ye have been healed by His stripes."

Μώλωψ is strictly "a weal," the livid mark left on the

body by a stripe or bruise (cf. Ecclus. xxviii. 17). It is here used collectively, like the Hebrew word חַבּוּרָה, for which it stands in Isaiah. Whilst intended, doubtless, to suggest the whole of our Lord's sufferings—the entire "chastisement of our peace"—still immediately the word carries our thoughts to the cruel *scourging* to which He was subjected; and the special aptness of such a reference in the present paragraph will be at once recognised. The paradox "healed through stripes," of which every Christian has felt the pathetic power, must have gone with an altogether peculiar force to the hearts of slaves, themselves so painfully familiar with unjust stripes (cf. Ecclus. xxiii. 10). The fact also, it may be observed in this connection, that the death of the Lord was by crucifixion, was fitted to exert a certain specialty of winning influence over slaves, seeing that the Romans confined this mode of punishment almost exclusively to these despised outcasts.

Ver. 25. Proof is here given of the actual healing,—the apostle passing, however, from the figure of restoration from disease to another familiar scriptural representation of the Christian's spiritual history, return from wandering. In making this transition, Peter's mind is still following the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, where immediately after "with His stripes we are healed," comes (ver. 6) "all we like sheep have gone astray" (*πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν*, LXX.). For the aorist, the apostle substitutes the pictorial *ἦτε πλανώμενοι*, "ye were wandering,"—"from day to day, as you so vividly remember, you were, some of you for many years, stumbling on from one form of sin and of unhappiness into another,—wandering foolishly, aimlessly, and to your hurt, as sheep are so apt to do."—The aorist *ἐπεστράφητε*, "ye turned," points historically to the time of conversion; but in translating, seeing that "now" is attached to it, English idiom requires a perfect. On this connection of *νῦν* with an aorist, see i. 12, note. As *ἐπεστράφητε* answers in the explanatory clause to *ἰάθητε* in the principal one, perfect parallelism

would require ἐπεστράφητε to be taken, like ἰάθητε, in a passive sense (so Wiesinger and others); but such minute exactness of correspondence is not at all needed, and according to ordinary usage, both among classical writers and in N. T., the second aorist passive of ἐπιστρέφειν has a middle force; cf. Mark viii. 33; John xxi. 20. The sense "turn *back*, *re*turn," which a reader naturally and justly gives to ἐπιστρέφειν here, where the thought is of man turning to the true Lord and Friend from whom he had strayed, does not belong to the word etymologically or always; but it frequently has it; *e.g.* cf. 2 Pet. ii. 22; Matt. xii. 44.

There is abundant N. T. proof that, by the time this Epistle was written, ἐπίσκοπος was the name of an office-bearer in the Christian congregations, the same office-bearer who was otherwise known as πρεσβύτερος; and from Eph. iv. 11 it is clear that, at least among those Asiatic Christians to whom Peter was now writing, ποιμήν, "pastor," was also a recognised name of office. We cannot well doubt, therefore, that when the apostle here describes the Lord Jesus as *Ποιμὴν καὶ Ἐπίσκοπος*, he means the thought of these officers of the Church to come into view. On the one hand, by his present application of the names, he suggests to those who held the offices to rejoice in the privilege and honour which had been given them of being fellow-workers with Christ, and for the same reason to cherish a deep sense of the greatness of their responsibility; and, on the other hand, he reminds the private members of the Church that they should never in any measure content themselves with earthly ministrations, however attractive, but should live in habitual communion with the Divine Pastor and Bishop. Along with this view of the reference, however, the use of the image of sheep in the earlier part of the verse clearly calls upon us to regard the primary meaning "shepherd" as present also, and indeed prominent, in ποιμήν, and in connection with this to bring out the primary sense of ἐπίσκοπος, "overseer,"—which the name "bishop," though simply an altered form of "episcop," fails to

do to an English reader. "Shepherd," from its variety of application, serves sufficiently as a rendering of *ποιμήν* in the passage, but it is probably impossible by any one English word to exhibit at once the primary and the secondary use of *ἐπίσκοπος*. The Revisers of our version have had to content themselves with putting "bishop" in the text and "overseer" in the margin. It may fairly be questioned whether, as the image of the return of sheep to their shepherd certainly seems to be in the foreground, and the ecclesiastical reference behind, it would not have been better to relegate "bishop" to the margin, and set "overseer" in the text. By some expositors—resting on the fact that in O. T. God is sometimes spoken of as the Shepherd of Israel, and that in LXX. Job xx. 29, He is designated *Ἐπίσκοπος*—the words *ποιμὴν καὶ ἐπίσκοπος* here are applied, not to Christ, but to God the Father. The general N. T. usage, however (our Lord delighting to describe Himself as the Shepherd of His people, as in John x. 11 foll.; Matt. xxvi. 31; cf. also Heb. xiii. 20), and in particular, quite decisively, the language of Peter himself in chap. v. 4, show that his reference here is to the Lord Jesus. As regards the conjunction of the words *ποιμὴν καὶ ἐπίσκοπος*, compare the similar combination of the cognate verbs in chap. v. 2 (according to the ordinary reading),—also, as somewhat similar, LXX. Ezek. xxxiv. 11. There seems to be an echo of the combination in Ignatius's words (*Rom.* § 9): *τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας, ἥτις ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ ποιμένι τῷ Θεῷ χρῆται· μόνος αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐπισκοπήσει.*—As to Peter's use of *ψυχή*, cf. ver. 11, note.

CHAPTER III.

Vv. 1–6. *On the duties of wives.*

After the counsels to servants we naturally look for a statement of the correlative duties of masters, such as follows the address to servants in Ephesians and in Colossians. But Peter does not touch on these. His mind, as it appears, was wholly occupied, at this stage of his letter, with the thought of positions in which the prominent duty was *submission*. Starting with the general precept laid down by him in ii. 13, he has dwelt first on civil government and on slavery, doubtless as being those *ἀνθρώπιναι κτίσεις* from the obligation of submission to which Christians were most likely to believe themselves emancipated, seeing that commonly subjects and slaves are such, not through any choice of their own, but by birth or conquest. Now he passes on to speak of marriage, into the formation of which, indeed, personal choice enters or should enter, but in which wives — taught that in Christ "there was neither male nor female," so that they stood in fellowship with their Lord, not mediately as represented by their husbands, but immediately as themselves His disciples and friends — might not unnaturally be in some cases tempted to think themselves set free from the obligation of obedience.

Ver. 1. The similarity, set forth by *ὁμοίως*, of the case now introduced to that of servants, obviously, as has just been indicated, lies mainly in the fact that *ὑποταγή*, the special duty connected with the position of servants, is also that aspect of a wife's obligations which the apostle's line of thought

leads him to make prominent. Throughout Greece and the Greek East at this time, as innumerable passages in the classical writers show, the position of a wife was held generally to be not greatly different from that of a slave, and wives were treated by their husbands often with contempt and cruelty. The sublime wisdom of the apostolic mode of presenting those principles, through the working of which Christianity was ultimately to place woman in her true relation to man, is beautifully exemplified in the present address to wives, and in the short one which follows to husbands.

The absence of the interjection ὦ with the vocative γυναῖκες is in accordance with ordinary N. T. usage. In most of the instances where ὦ does occur, indeed, it is not, as with classical writers, a mere sign of address, but an exclamation of feeling; cf. *e.g.* Acts xiii. 10; Gal. iii. 1.—On the construction of the participle ὑποτασσόμεναι, see ii. 18, note. —By some expositors ἰδίοις here is held to be altogether unemphatic. This is scarcely tenable. In later Greek this adjective (as also οἰκεῖος) came undoubtedly to be employed as equivalent to an unemphatic pronoun; but that in N. T. the word is ever used quite in this way is not altogether clear (on some of the most likely cases, as Matt. xxii. 5, xxv. 14, cf. Meyer, *in locc.*); and that in the great majority of passages where it occurs the distinctive force of "own" is to be recognised, is certain. In the present case this force of the word is perfectly natural, and in itself presents an argument, thus,—"to those whom, remember, you have taken to be your own, yours in an altogether peculiar sense, and who therefore have, according to the nature of the relation, an altogether peculiar claim on your obedience." Says Leighton, "The Christian wife, that hath love to God, though her husband be not so comely, nor so wise, nor so amiable as many others, yet because he is *her own husband*, therefore she loves and obeys."—The unclassical construction found here of ἵνα with the future indicative occurs a good many times in N. T.,

particularly in Revelation: see Winer, p. 361; A. Buttmann, p. 234.

Whether *καὶ εἰ*, *εἰ καί*, or simply *εἰ*, should be read, is very uncertain. MS. authority seems to be somewhat in favour of *καὶ εἰ*, which has accordingly been placed in the text. If internal grounds of judgement be regarded, *εἰ καί* might perhaps appear to be more likely,—*καί* in this latter combination not, as in the other, belonging to *εἰ*, and marking the supposition as an improbable one, but applying to the statement made in the clause, and simply indicating that the case supposed is one harder than others to reconcile with the apodosis. On the force of *εἰ καί* and *καὶ εἰ*, which latter occurs in N. T. much more rarely than the other, see Winer, p. 554, particularly Dr. Moulton's notes.—On *ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ*, see ii. 8, note. The state of spirit indicated by this expression, in both passages, is not of a mere negative kind, but is that of persons who, possessing some knowledge of the truth, were in positive antagonism to it.—The use of *τῶν γυναικῶν* here instead of *ὑμῶν* has been by some scholars supposed to show that in writing this verse the thought had not in the apostle's mind the form of direct address, but that the imperative to be supplied is in the 3rd person, and *γυναῖκες* at the beginning to be taken consequently, not as vocative, but nominative. There is no need for this supposition, the use in direct address, in such a clause as this, of the general term "wives" or of the special "you" being really equally natural, and the choice between them simply a matter of style. The second part of the same sentence is shown by *ὑμῶν* (ver. 2) to be direct; and the whole series of precepts, of which the present forms a part, seems to have been conceived throughout in the same form; see ii. 13, 17, 20; iii. 6, 9.

The thought is a natural one, that in *ἄνευ λόγου* the reference intended is precisely the same as in *τῷ λόγῳ* preceding. It is plain, however, that the *κερδαίνεσθαι* spoken of in the present clause cannot be effected without the word of God: it is, in fact, a being won to the gospel, and through the

gospel to God. To take the meaning to be "without the influence of *public preaching* of the word," or to refer κερδηθήσονται merely to a preparatory conciliation of the unbelieving husband, by which a fair hearing will be secured for the gospel, appears somewhat forced. It seems, too, that while, no doubt, in the N. T. style a noun which is unquestionably definite is after a preposition often found without the article, still here, had the apostle meant "the word of God," the article would probably have been used, considering the risk of ambiguity and the strongly marked definiteness of this particular reference of λόγου. The meaning therefore probably is, "without speech, without talking" ("without setting up for a preacher," *sans faire la prêcheuse*, Renan). The case supposed is that in which husbands are in such a state of feeling that they would be irritated and hardened by being spoken to about religion, but may through God's grace be softened and gained over by the sight of the pure and loving life of their wives. We can hardly help thinking, however, that the apostle had still distinctly in his mind the λόγῳ which he had written immediately before, and seeing that, of course, the "talk" pointed to in ἄνευ λόγου is "talk about the gospel," we recognise something of linguistic play,—thus, "that if any are disobedient to the word, they may without word about it be won." In the case supposed the gospel, as revealed, not by the lips, but by the life of the believing wives, was to gain the husbands. "The silence often of pure innocence | Persuades when speaking fails" (*Winter's Tale*, ii. 2). In its connection here κερδηθήσονται has evidently a rich comprehensiveness of reference,—"be won to their God and Saviour, and thereby be won also to their wives as now theirs in a fulness of love and confidence and sympathy unknown before:" cf. 1 Cor. ix. 19 foll. In Phil. iii. 8, Paul by the same verb presents another aspect of the position.

Ver. 2. Here we have in a participial clause an epexegesis of the previous statement of instrumentality, διὰ τῆς τῶν

γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς.—On ἐποπτεύσαντες, and on the thought given in this clause, cf. ii. 12, notes. As the ἐποπτεύειν brings about the κερδαίνεσθαι, the priority of the former is naturally exhibited by the use of the aorist participle.—Seeing that evidently (vv. 1, 6) the apostle has the duty of *obedience* so much before his mind, φόβῳ in the connection means, not "fear of God," but "reverence for your husbands." Cf. ii. 18, note, and particularly Eph. v. 33. This being the reference of φόβος in the passage, the combination ἐν φόβῳ cannot well be naturally taken (as may be in the similarly interjected ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ, i. 14) as having strongly an instrumental or causal force, seeing that the ἁγνὴ ἀναστροφή springs immediately from a Christian woman's loyalty to God, independently of any relation to a husband. The idea in ἐν seems to be simply semi-local, that of the sphere or element, —"manifestly surrounded and pervaded by reverence." The rendering of the English versions, "coupled with fear," while correct so far as it goes, seems hardly adequate.—In ἁγνή the prominent thought is no doubt that of chastity, but in a passage like the present the wide original reference of the word is naturally to be understood, including generally freedom from everything of grossness and sensuality, "purity" in the broadest sense of that word.

Vv. 3–6. These verses contain an exhortation to Christian wives to regard as their true adornment, not the decoration of the body, but beauty of spirit,—this precept being supported by an appeal to the example of the honoured matrons of Scripture story. That in the apostle's mind this exhortation stood in close connection with that of vv. 1, 2, is shown by the mode in which, in ver. 5, to ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς is attached ὑποτασσόμεναι τ. ἰ. ἀ. Peter's aim evidently was to show that the submission he had been urging was, in the relation of wives to their husbands, the legitimate expression of that purity and beauty of heart which Christianity introduces; and that the attractiveness for their husbands, which some of them perhaps tried to secure by undue attention to

external decoration, would be obtained in a far higher degree by faithful and loving discharge of duty,—through which too, in many cases, the immeasurable joy might be reached of winning their husbands to Christ.

The question naturally arises whether the prohibition here given of outward ornament, seemingly absolute, is really so. Now ἔνδυσις ἱματίων being included in the prohibition, whilst *some* ἱμάτια *must* be worn, it is certain in this case, and from the parallelism is reasonably inferred also as regards the others, that the reference is simply to what is undue, inconsistent with the principles of Christian decorum and stewardship for God. Here, as with innumerable other Christian laws, a principle is laid down in Scripture, whilst very much with regard to the mode of carrying it out amid the varying circumstances of life is left to be determined by individual Christian judgement. The fact that in Peter's enumeration of the constituents of a worldly woman's κόσμος he uses in each instance a substantive expressive of *action*—though, of course, the ornament really consists, not in the ἐμπλοκή, περίθεσις, and ἔνδυσις, but in the plaited hair itself, the jewels, and the fine clothes—seems to show, as Bengel remarks, that a very prominent thought in the apostle's mind had reference to undue expenditure of time and attention on the *work* of bodily adornment. To the precept of Peter here, one of Paul's (1 Tim. ii. 9, 10) is very similar in its substance. When we consider the lateness in Paul's life of the Epistles to Timothy, however, and the fact that their being in the first instance of a private character would probably make their circulation somewhat slow, it is hardly likely that the passage referred to was before our apostle's mind in writing. The whole precept—as regards both its details of those forms of bodily display on which women wasted thought and time and money, and its description of a woman's true adornment—may quite naturally be thought of as having been a commonplace of primitive practical Christian teaching. It is likely that Christian exhortation on this subject was very common, as being—

judging from all that we know of the manners of the age—much needed. The excessive devotion of women to elaborate personal adornment, and particularly to the costly decoration of their hair, attracted the attention of thoughtful observers even among the heathen,—Juvenal, Suetonius, and others. From statements of the Fathers too, especially of Clement of Alexandria (*Pæd.* ii. 11, 13, iii. 11), we see that in later times also the conduct in this respect of many Christian women caused anxiety to their spiritual guides.

Ver. 3. On the continuative use of the relative pronoun at the beginning of a new sentence, exemplified here in ὧν (for καὶ ὑμῶν), see A. Buttmann, p. 282. We may construe ὧν in either of two ways. It may, in accordance with the familiar construction of εἶναι with a genitive, be connected immediately with ἔστω,—"and let yours (your special possession or distinction, your characteristic) be;" or, from the subject, κόσμος may be supplied as predicate. At first sight the former of these may seem to suit better the second part of the subject-combination, in which ἄνθρωπος is the leading word. Seeing, however, from the use of the adjective πολυτελές, and especially from οὕτως γὰρ . . . ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς which follows, that the idea of "ornament" was clearly in the writer's mind throughout the whole section, it is indifferent, so far as the context is concerned, which construction be chosen; and the two are about equally natural.—On the fact that even in clauses, like the present, of the kind which most rigidly require the subjective negative μή, οὐκ is occasionally found in cases where, as here, the particle does not belong strictly to the main verb, but to a word or combination which is set in antithesis to another, see A. Buttmann, p. 352. Contrast the construction in v. 2, 3, where the use of μή shows that the thought of the *prohibition* is more vividly before the writer's mind than that of the mere antithesis.—On the frequent use in N. T., as in classical Greek, of ἔξωθεν and ἔσωθεν as practically equivalent to ἔξω and ἔσω, see Winer, p. 592; A. Buttmann, p. 70.—For χρυσία in the quite classical sense of "ornaments of gold,"

cf. Rev. xvii. 4, xviii. 16. — It will be observed that the apostle connects "plaiting of hair" with "putting on of gold ornaments" by *καί*, and then for the following connective uses *ἤ*. In the somewhat parallel passage already referred to, 1 Tim. ii. 9, precisely the same change of conjunctions is found. The ground of this change can hardly be determined with certainty. It may be that the gold ornaments of which the apostles were thinking particularly were for the *hair*, and therefore the first two specifications went closely together: or perhaps their thought was of bodily adornment as made up of two divisions, viz. elaborate arrangement of the ornament which belongs to the body itself, the hair, *and* expensive arraying of the body with materials from without,—the subdivisions of this array being put disjunctively by "or."

Ver. 4. In contrast with the *ἔξωθεν κόσμος* of the worldling, the Christian woman is to have the *κρυπτὸς κόσμος* of spiritual beauty. "Submission to their own husbands" is to be no superficial thing, but to spring up from the deep hidden fountain of sanctified affections. With growth in Christian wisdom anxiety to be looked at and admired will always become less, whilst longing to have richer beauty investing that inner nature which, though hidden from man, lies full before the view of God, will become always stronger. The word *κρυπτός*, while, of course, immediately set in antithesis to *ἔξωθεν*, suggests also and leads on to *ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*.—In illustrating the connection in the note above, the expression *κρυπτὸς κόσμος* was used; but whilst, as what follows shows, the *thought* of "ornament" is still distinctly before the apostle's mind, he does not here employ the *word*. He proceeds, instead, to bring out directly, and in a most vivid way, the vastness of the contrast between the dead things, the fine clothes and jewels, of the woman of the world, and the adornment of the Christian woman, by joining to *κρυπτός* the word *ἄνθρωπος*, implying life, energy, thought, will, affection. This image of 'the inner man" for the intellectual and spiritual nature, in contrast with the material element of our being, is

familiar to us in the Apostle Paul's writings. When we consider that, looking away from Paul's Epistles, the figure is not found in N. T. except in the present passage,—that it occurs in two of the Pauline letters which may reasonably be supposed to have been known to many of those Asiatic Christians for whom Peter's letter was intended, the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians,—and that, whereas Paul usually illustrates the image somewhat, in so far at least as by giving a distinct statement of the antithesis, Peter here, by giving no explanation, seems to assume its familiarity to his readers,—considering these things, it seems likely that here our apostle had Paul's frequent use of the figure in his mind, and intended to refer the thoughts of his readers to that use.

The antithesis in ὁ ἔξω and ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (Rom. vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16), to which that here in ὁ ἔξωθεν κόσμος and ὁ κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος answers, has obviously distinct elements from that in ὁ παλαιὸς and ὁ καινὸς (νέος) ἄνθρωπος (Rom. vi. 6; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10). As a matter of fact, however, "the inner man," in the places where Paul uses the expression, is not the soul taken generally, but is "the new man," the soul of a *regenerate* man, enlightened and sanctified by the Divine Spirit. In our passage also, clearly, seeing that writer and reader carry with them into the clause the thought of the adornment of a *Christian* woman, the κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος is the inner being regarded as regenerate. Some expositors suppose the idea of regenerate not to be given till the words ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ κτλ.; but the form of the sentence appears decidedly to suggest that in the simple name "the hidden man" we are to understand the true ornament as fully set before us, and that the following words only elucidate what has been there already implicitly presented.—"The hidden man" is described as τῆς καρδίας, which seems best taken as having somewhat the force of a *possessive* genitive, "the heart's hidden man:" the affections and energies summed up by the name "man" belong to the heart, from it they start forth, and conduct in the outer life

which professes to be the action of "the hidden man" is really such—has value and beauty in God's sight—only when it is in vital connection with the heart. Thus the "man" is the heart's property. Some such notion of possession as this, not meant to be very rigidly defined, suits the proprieties of the figure better than taking the genitive as one of apposition, —"the hidden man of (= who is, that is to say) the heart." A prosaic explanation like this does not seem to accord with the lively poetic form of the sentence.

The *καρδία*, then, which might have been represented as the abode of "the hidden man," having been, in fact, exhibited rather in something of a possessive relation, the clause goes on to describe his abode (or possibly, for the preposition would suit either view, his apparel),—and this in a way to set forth with emphasis the enduring beauty and glory of this "man," this true ornament of the Christian. The "outward adorning" is only of the perishable body; "the hidden man" has his sphere of action, lives and moves, in the immortal spirit. To the imperishableness of this home, contrasting so impressively with the transitoriness of the scene of the display of outward ornaments, special prominence is given by a bright poetic turn in the mode of expression, making *τὸ ἄφθαρτον* (= *ἡ ἀφθαρσία*) stand out as itself the abode. The outward adorning dwells in perishableness, "the hidden man" in immortality —that immortality which belongs to the immaterial element of our being, here described by the name employed in Scripture to set it forth in its highest powers and relations, "the spirit," the glorious moral nature by which we can know God and live in fellowship with Him. In the case supposed this "spirit," illuminated and sustained by the Divine Spirit, does live in fellowship with God, and has the heavenly beauty which He imparts.

The form of beauty here specified by the apostle is, in accordance with the immediate object of the whole passage, that which should be specially characteristic of Christian *women*. Between *πραέως* and *ἡσυχίου* Bengel draws a dis-

tinction somewhat as of active and passive: the former, *qui non turbat*, the latter, *qui turbas aliorum fert placide*. This distinction has hardly his usual felicity. From the ordinary use of the words one may fairly think that, as so often in similar combinations, the two adjectives have been employed rather to give by accumulation expression to one thought in a strong way, than to two thoughts meant to be precisely discriminated. In so far as there is distinction, it seems to be as follows: the second word is somewhat more general than the other, describing the state of soul of which "meekness" is one manifestation. The English rendering, "meek and quiet," brings out the sense perfectly, — "free always from anger, revenge, and sullenness, notwithstanding the troubles and irritations which beset every life, and which are likely very specially to beset the life of a Christian woman married to an unbelieving husband,—and having this meekness in and through quietness of heart, restfulness of soul in the assurance of God's love and care." As to the exact force of πραΰς, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* §§ 42, 43. It is not impossible that in the combination πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου we have one of Peter's many echoes of O. T. language. In Isa. lxvi. 2, the LXX. has ταπεινὸν καὶ ἡσύχιον; but Clement of Rome (§ 13), quoting this verse of Isaiah, has πραῢν καὶ ἡσύχιον,—which also is Chrysostom's form in his quotations (see reff. in Jacobson, *in loc. cit.* Clem. Rom.). It is perhaps more likely that this was a various reading of the LXX., than that both of these Fathers should have been swayed away from correct citation by a remembrance of Peter's words.—On the loose connection of ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ with ὁ κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος, without a repetition of the article, cf. *e.g.* Rom. vi. 4; Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14; and see Winer, p. 169; A. Buttmann, p. 91. — On the well-supported form of the genitive πραέως, for πραέος of the older Greek, see A. Buttmann, p. 26. A similar form, also well supported, is βαθέως, Luke xxiv. 1.

Instead of taking "the incorruptible" as for the abstract, "the incorruptibleness or imperishableness," some scholars

have from the first part of the sentence brought in κόσμῳ as a supplement in this clause, either (so R. E. V.) immediately with τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ, "in the incorruptible adornment (apparel)," or (so A. E. V.) in apposition, "in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament." This supplement is, looking at the structure of the clause, not very natural, and does not seem to be needed, or to add anything to the beauty or sublimity of the apostle's picture.—The neuter relative, which introduces the last clause of the verse, has as its natural antecedent πνεύματος, or—which in meaning would come to the same thing, if taken as concrete in the way adopted in the A. E. V.—τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ. We have seen reason to take τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ rather as abstract, in which sense it is not suitable as the antecedent. Πνεύματος seems to be the intended reference. It is true that the predicate πολυτελές describes the preciousness of the *ornament* of a Christian woman,—which ornament, according to the figure in the sentence, is "the hidden man;" but this does not make it necessary to refer ὅ to ἄνθρωπος and all its adjuncts, gathered up by the neuter as "a thing which." When the apostle's expansion of his figure is rigidly construed, the "meek and quiet spirit" is that in which the "hidden man" abides; but the mind, not dwelling on this, easily passes to think of these two as practically synonymous,—so that the relative may quite well be attached immediately to πνεύματος.

Vv. 5, 6. The exhortation to give main thought and care to spiritual adornment is supported by a reference to the example of the much-revered godly women of Bible history, Sarah, Hannah, and others. Special mention is naturally made of the case of Sarah, to whom—as the wife of Abraham, and as a woman not indeed without serious flaws of character, yet in true and deep sympathy with her husband in his consecration to God—a like precedence is readily given among the O. T. matrons as among the men of faith has been by all generations allowed to Abraham.

Ver. 5 The apparent correlation in this sentence of οὕτως

and ὡς (ver. 6) is merely accidental,—the course of thought showing clearly enough that οὕτως points back, "in that way," viz. "with meekness and obedience," whilst ὡς means "as, for example."—With regard to the meaning of the word ἅγιος, see note on ἁγιασμός, i. 2. Whilst the idea of reverend *dignity*, through separation for God, is never absent from the word, yet in many instances the ethical aspect of the meaning is decidedly and obviously prominent. Sometimes, however, both ideas present themselves with much distinctness, as when we read of "the holy prophets" (Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21), and of "the holy apostles and prophets" (Eph. iii. 5). In the place before us, also, when we read of "the holy women," we naturally take this expression somewhat in the same way,—the idea suggested to us, if fully set forth, being "those pious women to whom, as His servants, God has given a special dignity, by enshrining their names in the historical records included in His word" ("those women of blessed memory," Fronmüller).

The epexegetical clause, "who placed their hope in God," comes in obviously with much naturalness, seeing that this was the particular side of their piety on which immediately their meekness and submission to their husbands rested. They also, like those women to whom the apostle was now writing, had sometimes difficulties to contend with in their relations to their husbands,—inconsiderate conduct, misconceptions, perhaps wrongs; but, believing in God's providence and grace, they had a confident expectation (such is the ἐλπίς of Scripture) that He would make darkness light before them and crooked things straight, and therefore they cast their care upon Him. For the construction ἐλπίζειν εἰς, cf. John v. 45; 2 Cor. i. 10; see also in our Epistle ἐλπίζειν ἐπί, i. 13, note; and cf. A. Buttmann, p. 175. The words αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι may be taken either, according to a frequent use in N. T. of the present participle with the article (*e.g.* Matt. xxvii. 40; Eph. iv. 28), without temporal reference, and almost with the force of a substantive, "the hopers in God" (Winer, p. 444; A.

Buttmann, p. 296), or as a participle of the imperfect (Winer, p. 428), exactly = *αἳ ἤλπιζον*. The latter view seems the more natural.—On the connection of *ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς* with the participial clause *ὑποτασσόμεναι κτλ.*, see above, introductory note on vv. 3–6.—On the force of *ἰδίοις* as here used, see above, ver. 1, note.

Ver. 6. Whilst in the words "calling him lord" there is no doubt a reference to Gen. xviii. 12, it seems clear that the aorist *ὑπήκουσεν*, if the true reading, is not meant to point simply to the particular incidents there described, but to indicate general character,—there being, indeed, on the occasion spoken of in that passage, nothing mentioned illustrative of "obedience," except the proof of respectful feeling given by the mere use of the word "lord." But the aorist, as employed to exhibit general character, has a quite peculiar strength, the life being, so to speak, gathered up and set forth as a single historical fact; cf. ii. 22, note. The imperfect *ὑπήκουεν* is also a well-supported reading here, and it is difficult to decide between it and the aorist. As so often happens, consideration of probability based on internal grounds does not help us much. The aorist may seem to be favoured by the canon of difficulty, inasmuch as a thinking copyist, perceiving that the reference is to general character, and not remembering the occasional use of the aorist in this way, might naturally substitute the imperfect. On the other hand, however, a less sensible though not altogether unthinking copyist might easily at once infer, from the mention of Sarah's "calling her husband lord," that the sole reference in the passage is to the incident recorded in Gen. xviii., and might therefore substitute the aorist for the imperfect. With regard to the measure of reverence illustrated by Sarah's use, on the occasion immediately referred to, of the word "lord," it is not unimportant to remember that she is represented as employing the term in speaking to *herself*,—a kind of discourse which brings out with special exactness the real habits of thought and feeling.

The clause *ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα* enforces the argument

based on the examples just adduced, by reminding the Christian women who are addressed that through faith they had entered into close spiritual relationship with the holy matrons of Israel, particularly with Sarah. She was the representative woman of faith, the mother of God's Israel,—that Israel which, as Paul had so abundantly and clearly taught his converts, and among them these Asiatic believers, was, as regarded its loftiest functions and its highest and permanent privileges, not a body of kinsfolk through earthly descent, but a spiritual association through faith, gathered out of all kindreds and peoples. Those women whom Peter addresses, then, had "become Sarah's children" when they by faith accepted the God and the Messiah of Israel. This is one of those passages in this Epistle with which the view that in the opening words of the letter the apostle is to be regarded as addressing it solely to *Jewish* Christians, does not agree at all well. It is no doubt true that Jewish women, when they accepted the Lord Jesus as their Saviour, became Israelites, daughters of Sarah, in a deeper, grander sense than they had been before; but, supposing the reference in the present passage to be to them alone, it would certainly have been natural to add some explanatory phrase,—"spiritually," "by faith," or the like. On the other hand, supposing those addressed to be mainly Gentile women, the spiritual nature of the relation to Sarah was at once understood.

The participial clause which closes the verse appears to have the force of a protasis, the connection and sense being substantially this, "whose daughters ye became,—if, that is to say, ye are proving yourselves Christians indeed by faithful and resolute well-doing." The present participles as used of conduct *subsequent* to the "becoming daughters," associate themselves a little oddly with the aorist ἐγενήθητε, taken strictly; but, in a verb of this kind, the sense of the aorist so immediately suggests that of the perfect, or practically of ἐστέ, that the connection is quite natural.—On Peter's use of ἀγαθοποιεῖν, cf. ii. 15, note.—In μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν

πτόησιν the construction does not seem meant to be taken as that of the cognate accusative, "fearing no fear," that is, simply, "never being afraid." This construction appears to require, not merely that the substantive and verb be kindred in meaning, but that they be cognate in derivation, as φόβον φοβεῖσθαι (Mark iv. 41). In the somewhat peculiar expression before us, moreover, there seems to be not improbably a reminiscence of Prov. iii. 25, οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσῃ πτόησιν (LXX.), where the parallel in the latter clause of the verse shows distinctly that πτόησιν is used—as nouns denoting the emotions of fear, hope, and the like are so apt to be in any language—for the exciting object, "cause of terror." In our passage, similarly, the probable force is well given by the R. E. V., "not put in fear by any terror." The language being quite general, the reference is naturally taken to be to any of the many sources of alarm which in a heathen country, and in a persecuting age, might, through the action of womanly timidity, shake constancy in the exhibition of Christian character. "The meek and quiet spirit" of the wise Christian woman is to be understood as having nothing in it of feebleness, irresolution, or cowardice. The leading thought in the apostle's mind, however, was probably one of qualifying the main injunction of the whole section, "Be obedient to your own husbands, and this even if they be unbelieving,"—the qualification given here being, "but bear in mind always that your supreme duty—that with which nothing can be permitted to interfere—is to obey God, and therefore, should your husbands forbid you, and that with threats, to do anything which you know God to have enjoined, let no terror of this kind frighten you, but rest in the Lord."

The peculiarity at first sight, adverted to above, in the connection of the present participles of this clause with the aorist ἐγενήθητε, has led some scholars to take the first part of the verse, from ὡς Σάρρα to τέκνα, as a parenthesis,—in which case, of course, ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι and φοβούμεναι agree,

not with the subject of ἐγενήθητε, but with αἱ ἅγιαι γυναῖκες, and continue the description of their character. This construction does not seem a likely one. Parentheses no doubt abound in N. T., particularly in the writings of Paul; but, if longer than two or three words, they commonly mingle with and modify the construction of the main sentence. A strictly *formal* parenthesis so long as that here supposed, is hardly consistent with Scripture style. The statement, "whose daughters ye became," seems bald, too, if unsustained by any addition. The fact is to be noted also, that, on the proposed view of the construction, the negation in the last clause would in its character be objective, purely historical, and properly therefore expressed by οὐκ; whereas, if the participles agree with the subject of ἐγενήθητε, μή is quite in place. Of this, however, not much can be made in the way of argument, so greatly predominant in N. T. is the use of μή with participles, even where the subjective aspect can hardly be recognised. So far as the substance of the apostle's exhortation is concerned, it is plainly immaterial which of the constructions be followed, because these "holy women" of Scripture are set forth as models to those who are here addressed.

Ver. 7. *On the duties of husbands.*

As was suggested in the notes on ver. 1 of this chapter, the probable reason for our apostle's omission to follow up his address to servants (ii. 18–25) with one to masters, as seems natural, was his having his mind occupied at that stage of his writing with the special duty of obedience to earthly authorities. The series of exhortations to classes on whom that duty is particularly incumbent being closed, however, with the section addressed to wives, he turns now to the position correlative to that of wives, and, in a very brief but singularly comprehensive way, points out the duties attaching specially to it. In this section no case is singled

out like that in the former (ver. 1), of a believer married to an unbeliever. Judging both from what we know of the religious susceptibility of women generally, and from facts mentioned in the N. T. regarding the early progress of the gospel (*e.g.* Acts xvi. 1, 13, 14, xvii. 12), it is probable that the case of a believing man wedded to an unbelieving woman was much less common than the other. One would naturally gather the same from the apostle's mode of speaking in this verse, for he assumes that the wives of the men to whom he writes are also Christians, "joint heirs with their husbands of the grace of life." If unhappily in any instance, however, the case was not so, his arguments still were valid, for the believing husband must keep in view the riches of divine love, and the "joint-heirship" which thus through the work of the Spirit might yet be established.

The participial construction is still maintained (on which, as also on *οἱ ἄνδρες* used vocatively, see ii. 18, note). Now, however, there being a transition to a different class of duties, we cannot think of *ὑποτάγητε* (ii. 13) as being the main verb in the apostle's mind, but must fall back on the general exhortation preceding (ii. 11, 12), to which *ὑποτάγητε* is subordinate,—"Do the duties of your various spheres in such a way as to show to the heathen around you the heavenliness of your religion." Of course the participle here cannot well be regarded as in strict grammatical connection with ii. 11, 12; yet evidently the apostle's feeling is that he is dealing, not with a fully distinct precept, but with a *branch* of a great comprehensive precept. — In ver. 1, *ὁμοίως* was naturally judged to point to the similarity of the duty enjoined, the thought of "obedience" being carried forward. In the present verse, of course, this does not hold, and the reference of the word as used here is to the correlation of positions and duties, —"looking in the same way at the other side of the relation;" cf. v. 5, and a precisely similar use of the word in Ignat. *Trall.* § 3; also the use of *ὡσαύτως*, 1 Tim. ii. 9.

The injunction of the apostle is twofold. In the first

place, "Dwell according to knowledge with the female vessel as a weaker one (than you yourselves are)." The arrangement of words, "dwelling with—as a weaker vessel—the female (vessel)," though somewhat peculiar is quite intelligible, and has an exact parallel in i. 19. Here, as there, the words with ὡς are transposed from their usual position in order to bring them into immediate connection with certain words to which in the line of thought they are specially attached, τιμίῳ αἵματι in i. 19, and κατὰ γνῶσιν here.—The verb συνοικοῦντες is obviously to be taken with the widest reference, pointing to the close habitual association of married people in all its departments and aspects.—Γνῶσις here is Christian intelligence (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 6; 2 Pet. i. 5); κατὰ γνῶσιν therefore, "in accordance with intelligence, wisely." The reference no doubt includes generally an intelligent acquaintance with the principles of Christian duty as these bear on the relation of marriage, but in the position which the phrase has in the clause it enjoins specially an intelligent Christian consideration at all times of the ἀσθένεια of the wife, her comparative weakness physically, and her greater sensibility of temperament. To this specialty of reference in γνῶσιν the particle ὡς, which follows, answers, placing what it is attached to in a *subjective* aspect, "remembering that she is." According to a figure found occasionally elsewhere in N. T. (*e.g.* Acts ix. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 21), the Christian husband and wife—for that the husband is included in the category is shown by the use of the comparative ἀσθενεστέρῳ—are described by the apostle as σκεύη of God, "vessels" to receive and transmit the water of life, or more generally, according to a common use of σκεῦος, "instruments" for His service. This N. T. application of σκεῦος is based on that of the corresponding Hebrew word כְּלִי in O. T., *e.g.* Jer. l. 25. In the place before us the figure has plainly an argumentative force in support of the apostle's exhortation. The fact that, according to the law and teaching of Christ, woman is not to be looked at, as heathen men often regarded her, as an almost soulless being, fit for nothing

noble, but as, like man himself, an instrument in the divine hand for accomplishing great ends, is one which, before the γνῶσις of a Christian husband, at once invests his wife with dignity. Thus the mind is prepared for the more explicit teaching of the next clause on this head.

The second part of the injunction is, "Render honour to your wives, such honour as beseems persons who—besides being joint instruments with you in doing service to God—are also joint inheritors with you of the grace of life." Christian husbands, rejoicing in the knowledge that they "shall reign in life through Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 17), are to bear ever in mind that Christian wives also shall as certainly and as fully enjoy this dignity; and therefore, in their feelings and in their conduct towards them, are to give them the honour which becomes the heirs of such glory. The genitive ζωῆς is evidently of the so-called appositional character; "life" *is* the χάρις, "the gift of grace" (cf. Jas. i. 12).—The transition from the singular τῷ γυναικείῳ σκεύει, representative of a class, to the plural συνκληρονόμοις, is felt by every reader to be altogether easy and natural.

By many interpreters, including the translators of both the A. and R. E. V., the construction of this verse has been taken in a different way from that which has now been illustrated. These scholars place a comma after γνῶσιν, and put ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ under the government of ἀπονέμοντες instead of συνοικοῦντες. If, according to a well-supported reading, the nominative συνκληρονόμοι be read in place of the dative, this view has a little more likelihood than it has with the dative. But on either reading the other construction seems preferable. (1) The thought that ἀσθένεια is in itself a ground, not merely for care, protection, gentle dealing, but for τιμή, is according to this proposed construction set forth by the apostle, and not merely through the emphatic position of ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ, but through the fact that this emphatic position is obtained by a rare and very striking arrangement of words, is made markedly

prominent. Now this thought is peculiar, and was certainly so alien from Greek views and feelings, that, had this been the apostle's meaning, some explanation might naturally have been looked for. With a different reference, Paul, in 1 Cor. xii. 23, 24, has language somewhat analogous; but the precise idea there meant is in itself more easily apprehended than that here, and, moreover, is illustrated by details. (2) The arrangement of words answers perfectly to the view that we have two full, well-balanced, and, in mode of expression, pretty closely parallel clauses; whereas on the proposed construction there appears awkwardness in the form both of the first clause, very short and left without an expressed dative, and of the second clause, long and complicated, and with the particle ὡς introduced in it twice to set forth grounds of action which, though consistent, are not homogeneous or naturally associated so very closely.

The last clause of the verse exhibits a powerful motive for obedience to the injunction,—"that your prayers be not hindered." This motive might, no doubt, be presented in connection with an appeal for the discharge of any Christian duty, seeing that indulgence in any sin throws up a barrier between the soul and God (Ps. lxvi. 18). But no less obviously it has a specialty of force in its application here; for violation of the law of love, especially towards those who in God's providence are nearest to and most dependent on us, has a quite peculiarly chilling and deadening power, and is as a mist which certainly hides the face of God. There may perhaps be in προσευχάς a special reference to *family* prayers, from which most plainly the life is taken away by embitterment of any kind between husband and wife. But the word is in itself quite general, and points to the impeding of private devotion as well as of that of the household.—The verb ἐγκόπτειν belongs to the later Greek, and seems to have been somewhat offensive to the classical fastidiousness of the mediæval copyists of N. T., for, in four out of the five cases

where the word occurs, older compounds of κόπτω are found as various readings. The image in this verb (cf. Lightfoot or Ellicott on Gal. v. 7) appears to be that of "cutting up" a road by destroying bridges and the like, so as to impede an enemy's progress. The fairly supported various reading here, ἐκκόπτεσθαι, would mean (cf. Matt. iii. 10, v. 30; Job xix. 10, LXX.), that through failure in household love the prayers might be "cut off,"—not merely "hindered," as regards spirituality and power, but, through growth in hardness of heart, brought to a close altogether, even in form. The milder mode of expression, besides having much better MS. support, seems more suited to the form of the apostle's appeal.

Vv. 8–12. *Exhortation, addressed to Christians generally, to cultivate love, kindness, and humility.*

The connection of this exhortation with the series of advices introduced by ii. 11, 12, is shown by the continuation here of the participial, or in the present case to some extent adjectival, construction; cf. ver. 7, note.

Ver. 8. The apostle begins with an exhortation to the cultivation of those characteristics of heart and life which ought to distinguish Christians in their relations to fellow-Christians. Ὁμόφρονες and φιλάδελφοι have obviously to do with the Christian brotherhood, and therefore it may be assumed with certainty that in συμπαθεῖς also, which stands between these two, the apostle was thinking particularly of relations to believers, though the word itself might have a wider reference. In the last two adjectives of the verse, also, which are in themselves of a general character, a special reference to relations to fellow-Christians is probable, from the intimate way in which these adjectives are associated with the previous three as constituting one group, and from the connection in which one of them and words closely allied to the other are employed in Paul's writings (*e.g.* Eph. iv. 32;

Phil. ii. 3; Col. iii. 12). As, however, the last grace of the five mentioned, "humility of spirit," is the necessary basis not only of love and kindness to Christian brethren, but also of that right feeling and conduct amid the oppositions of the world to which attention is drawn in the next verse, this word afforded a natural point of transition from the one sphere to the other. Of the whole group of five adjectives here found none occurs elsewhere in the N. T. except *εὔσπλαγχνος* (Eph. iv. 32).

On the adverbial use of a number of accusatives, as here *τὸ τέλος*, see Winer, p. 288; A. Buttmann, p. 153. That *τὸ τέλος* has no reference to the close of the Epistle, but merely to the position of this section relatively to the exhortations begun in ii. 11, 12, is plainly shown by the continuance of the participial construction, and also by the use of *πάντες*, which expressly intimates that, in contrast with the previous addresses to special classes, the words of this exhortation are spoken to all the believers: "Finally, not to deal with particular classes any further" (*τί χρὴ ἰδιολογεῖσθαι*; Œcumenius). —The idea conveyed by the word *ὁμόφρων* occurs often in Paul's writings,—presented, however, in the verbal form *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν* (*e.g.* Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5). In N. T., as in classical Greek, *φρονεῖν*—like the English "to mind, to be minded"—is used with a wide stretch of reference, including the action of the affections and of the will as well as of the intellect, "to think, to have regard for, to like, desire." In an appeal to Christians for unity with regard to *φρονεῖν*, the main idea is that of oneness of feeling and aim, resting on that substantial oneness of thought as to all vital matters which is presupposed in the simple fact of their being addressed as Christians. The meaning of *ὁμόφρων* is very clearly and distinctly brought out in Phil. ii. 2–4, where the synonymous expression *ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε* is expanded in a series of participial clauses.

Whilst *συμπαθής* and its cognates have all quite naturally a tendency to lean in their meaning specially to the side of

"fellow-feeling with those who are *suffering*," and the verb *συμπαθεῖν* in both of the places where it occurs in N. T. (Heb. iv. 15, x. 34) has this special force, yet in classical use the words are by no means limited to a reference to suffering, but express fellow-feeling in emotions arising from pleasant experiences also. In the passage before us there seems no reason for narrowing the meaning, and the force of the word may safely be taken as that of Paul's injunction in Rom. xii. 15, "Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep." If we were to translate the word simply "compassionate," we should hardly be able to recognise in *εὔσπλαγχνοι* any specialty of meaning at all; whereas if *συμπαθεῖς* has its full reference, then quite naturally and helpfully emphasis is laid by *εὔσπλαγχνοι* on the more important of the two sides of sympathy.—On *φιλάδελφοι*, cf. i. 22, 23.—The adjective *εὔσπλαγχνος*, as used in N. T., naturally follows in its meaning the familiar Hellenistic sense of *σπλάγχνα*, "compassion," derived from the fact that among the Hebrews the imagined local seat of the feelings, which with us is the heart, was the higher viscera. As used in the N. T., the words of this root appear, from the connections in which they stand, to have the idea of tenderness specially prominent; and therefore the best rendering of *εὔσπλαγχνοι* is probably "tender-hearted." As observed above, the word seems to be brought in here to emphasize that duty of helpful pity for the poor and the distressed which has been already, but with somewhat less definiteness, indicated by *συμπαθεῖς*, —and also, one may fairly think, to lay stress on the importance of *tenderness* in feeling and manner in the discharge of the duty.—The last of this group of adjectives, *ταπεινόφρονες*, "lowly-minded," sets forth a feature of character without which none of the graces that have been already named could possibly exist in purity. Pride inevitably involves to some extent self-seeking. But love, kindness, and sympathy at once connect themselves with Christian lowliness of mind,— which springs from two sources, true self-knowledge, and a

perception, from the example of Christ, of the sublime duty and dignity of humbling ourselves in self-sacrificing love. On *ταπεινοφροσύνη*, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 42.

Looking back now over the group of adjectives in the verse, we see clearly at once the comprehensiveness and the connectedness of the apostle's exhortation; and the sum of the whole matter is that to which Paul leads us, after his illustration already adverted to (Phil. ii. 2–4) of the meaning of *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*, "Let that mind be in you (*τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν*) which was also in Christ Jesus" (ver. 5).

Ver. 9. The same supreme example was in all likelihood vividly before Peter's mind also at this stage of his exhortation, for when now, at the natural transition point (see above, introductory note on ver. 8) afforded by the mention of "lowliness of mind," he passes on to speak of the duties of believers amid the oppositions of the world, his words are such as at once to recall to the thoughts of every Christian the life of the Redeemer, being indeed but a slightly altered form of words employed of Christ in ii. 23.

Our apostle in his statement of the duty (on which cf. Matt. v. 39–48) begins with a reference to the suffering of material wrong of any kind, and then proceeds to speak of irritation by abusive language. Though the latter may be in itself in many cases an evil of a lighter kind than the other, the temptation to retaliate is often here peculiarly strong, from the facility with which verbal retort can be made. Thus the two clauses are well balanced in weight.—The injunction *μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ* occurs in two of the Pauline letters in substantially the same form as here (Rom. xii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 15). These two Epistles are among those which were most likely to be largely circulated throughout the Church early; the former, because of its signal importance, and of the frequent intercourse between Rome and all parts of the empire; the other, because it was the very first of the apostle's extant writings. The mode of expression may therefore quite possibly have suggested itself to Peter from

memory,—probably, with respect to a mere turn of expression like this, the unconscious action of memory.—The use here exemplified of the verb *ἀποδίδωμι*, in which obviously the thought of *back*, "render, return," is involved, is a very common one. This particular idea, however, does not seem to lie, as some scholars have supposed, in the preposition, for there is nothing in the ordinary meaning and use of *ἀπό* from which it could naturally be deduced. It appears to have been derived simply from usage, the word having come to be applied in a large number of cases where the connection naturally gave the idea of return; cf. ii. 25, *ἐπεστράφητε*, note.—In the antithesis to *λοιδορία, κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ* has plainly reference to material wrong, injury in action, though *κακόν* in itself is quite general, and indeed, as employed in ver. 10, points to sin of the tongue.

Τοὐναντίον (on the adverbial accusative, cf. ver. 8, note on *τὸ τέλος*) introduces with emphasis the positive side in the action of the new nature, "contrariwise, in direct opposition to these carnal impulses;" cf. 2 Cor. ii. 7; Gal. ii. 7.—In *εὐλογοῦντες* the immediate antithesis is with *λοιδορία*. It is true that the thought of resulting good connects itself at once with the word "bless," and in the present case every reader feels that the spirit of active love implied in *εὐλογοῦντες* extends not merely to the returning of good words for *λοιδορία*, but of good deeds for *κακόν*. Still the most natural reference is to "blessing" in the strict sense, "invoking God's kindness upon," in contrast with the last-mentioned form of wrong, "railing."—The last clause of the verse may be taken in two somewhat different ways, according to what is regarded as the reference in *τοῦτο*. (1) This reference may be retrospective, to *εὐλογοῦντες*, "because ye were called with a view to this, namely, your blessing others, your living in a spirit of active love." This connection is supported by the analogous case in ii. 21, where the reference obviously is to what precedes. Supposing that here *εἰς τοῦτο* means *εἰς τὸ εὐλογεῖν*, then two constructions are possible. (*a*) The clause introduced by *ἵνα*

may be connected with ἐκλήθητε, in which case ἵνα sets forth the divine purpose in calling them—to train them in the spirit of love, in order that, thus meetened for the land of perfect love, they might ultimately inherit it. (β) We may take the words ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε as a parenthesis, thus bringing ἵνα into immediate connection with εὐλογοῦντες, and making the last clause express not the divine purpose, but that of the Christians themselves, "blessing (for to this ye were called) in order to be blessed." This construction seems hardly a likely one, the parenthesis being bald and somewhat unnatural. (2) But instead of referring to what precedes, τοῦτο may point forward directly to ἵνα: "Ye were called with a view to this, namely, that," etc. (εἰς τοῦτο, ἵνα κτλ. thus = εἰς τὸ εὐλογίαν κληρονομῆσαι). This is supported by the analogous case in iv. 6; cf. John xviii. 37; 1 John iii. 8. On this connection the argument is, "Bless others, because the purpose of God's calling you is that ye may inherit blessing,—and for those whom even when they were His enemies God cared for, and by His grace made heirs of blessing, to do other than bless even their enemies, is opposed to the new nature of God's children, and a monstrous thing in God's sight." The words of Peter do not indeed express all this, but they suggest it, and the argument could not be obscure to any one who remembered the teaching of the Master regarding the unmerciful servant (Matt. xviii. 21–35), and regarding the true mode of proof that men have through faith become "children of our Father which is in heaven" (Matt. v. 45). These Asiatic Christians, too, had in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians read, "Forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you" (Eph. iv. 32). Whilst either view of the reference of τοῦτο yields a good meaning, and there is no very decisive argument in favour of the one over the other, this latter view seems on the whole the more likely.

The A. and R. E. V. render εὐλογίαν here "a blessing,"—*i.e.* no doubt, "a gift from God through His blessing," the special

reference being, of course, to heaven and its happiness. The same thought is given by Luther more definitely by *den Segen*. It may be questioned whether, considering the close connection of thought which the substantive here has with the verb εὐλογοῦντες, the conception of the inheritance which was before the apostle's mind was not that of "blessing," with the active force of the verb present (cf. Heb. vi. 7; Jas. iii. 10, in A. and R. E. V.), rather than that of "*a* (fruit of) blessing." The heritage meant seems to be "benediction," — the grace of God blessing us throughout eternity. Tyndale and the Geneva version both have simply "blessing" here. — In "inherit blessing" one can hardly but recognise a reminiscence of the Lord's great word in Matt. xxv. 34, "Come, ye *blessed* of my Father, *inherit* the kingdom."

Vv. 10–12. The general exhortation given in the two preceding verses is supported here by a quotation from Scripture, made, as is the apostle's wont (cf. *e.g.* i. 24, ii. 7, 9), without formal reference. The quotation is from Ps. xxxiv. 12–16, and is made from the LXX. almost verbatim, there being but one change which is of the least moment. The substance of the passage shows that the connection marked by γάρ (ver. 10) is with the whole of the two preceding verses. The choice of this particular O. T. exhortation for quotation, however, was possibly suggested by the last thought in ver. 9, regarding the believer's inheriting blessing: at all events the opening words of the passage from the Psalm accord perfectly with such a view, for ζωή and ἡμέραι ἀγαθαί associate themselves immediately with εὐλογία (cf. Ps. cxxxiii. 3, xxx. 5).— As Bengel has observed, the three forms of duty to which in vv. 8, 9, the apostle has turned the attention of his brethren, the cultivation of peace and love among themselves, and the abstaining in their intercourse with the world from revenge in action and from revengeful language, are all—though with greater generality of reference—spoken of in the passage quoted, but in the reverse order. It is worth noting, too, that these three precepts illustrate, in the form into which the

Psalmist has cast them, three different styles of the parallelism of Hebrew poetry.

The substance of the quotation is, "Live, my brethren, in love and peace and likeness of character to God; for, as God has told us in His word, the secret of true happiness is to do His will."

Ver. 10. The only deviation from the LXX. which is made in the quotation, other than merely of an altogether slight and formal kind, is here,—the LXX., which is substantially in accordance with the Hebrew, reading in the first clause *ὁ θέλων ζωὴν, ἀγαπῶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθάς*. Much ingenuity has been shown by commentators in endeavouring to prove that Peter's substitution of *ἀγαπᾶν καί* for *ἀγαπῶν* does not in the least alter the meaning, except perhaps by giving the expression of it a little more intensity. But the modes of construing and interpretation which are suggested with a view to this are all forced; and it seems clear that the apostle, whilst substantially in agreement with the LXX., yet by his slight alteration of phraseology introduces a new thought, interesting and impressive (*novum salem addit*, Bengel). Looking at the fact that under certain outward experiences, or as the issue of certain moods of feeling or trains of thought, life appears at times to multitudes of men to be dull, weary, even hateful (Job iii.; Eccles. ii. 17; Gen. xxvii. 46), the apostle says not merely, as the Psalmist does, "The man who desires life," but "The man who desires to love life," "The man who wants to feel vividly and joyfully that life is worth living,"—*i.e.* of course, practically, as is expressly set forth in the parallel of the second clause, "The man who wishes to have a happy life, to see good days (days full of good, and of what is felt to be good)." In this passage "life" is obviously in the first instance that here on earth, but under the light of the gospel the mind passes directly and unhesitatingly—as doubtless, even amid the dimness of O. T. revelation, the Psalmist's mind passed in a measure—to think also and chiefly of the full, glorious, endless life of heaven, "even length of days for ever and ever."

The idea of energetic restraint which is given in the word *παυσάτω* reminds us vividly of the wild and wicked impetuosity of the tongue by nature: cf. Jas. iii. 8. The classical construction of *παύειν* is with the simple genitive of the thing. This is also the apostle's own construction, if *ἁμαρτίας* be the correct reading in iv. 1. In the present place the LXX., which he follows, has, in accordance with the general Hellenistic tendency to prepositional constructions, introduced *ἀπό* before *κακοῦ*. In the following part of the clause, however, where the infinitive with *τοῦ* comes in, *ἀπό* is both in the LXX. and by Peter left out. This construction of *τοῦ λαλῆσαι* might be explained as an infinitive of purpose, "Let him refrain his lips, that they may speak no guile;" but, looking to the form of the whole sentence, it seems more natural to join *τοῦ λαλῆσαι* immediately with *παυσάτω*, "Let him refrain his lips from speaking guile." The occurrence in the clause of the negative *μή* does not present an objection to this view of the construction, for this particle, in its use after verbs of denying, withholding, hindering,—in which, no doubt, originally it had its proper negative force, the subordinate clause being thought of as one of purpose,—seems, from the form into which sentences of the kind are often thrown, to have ultimately been practically pleonastic. The pleonasm is doubted by some modern scholars; but certainly in cases at least—such as the present —where *τοῦ* is prefixed to the infinitive, and where the governing verb is one to which a genitive may be immediately attached, it seems at times strained to regard the construction as different from what it would have been had the genitive of the derived verbal substantive stood in place of the infinitive of the verb: cf. Winer, pp. 409, 755; A. Buttmann, pp. 269, 355; and Ellicott on Gal. v. 7.—The parallelism in this first precept is that of a general and a particular statement,—*κακοῦ* here evidently referring to sin of the tongue of all kinds, whilst *δόλον* gives prominence to one form of the sin, that to which there is the strongest and most frequent temptation, and by which harm is most commonly done to others.

Ver. 11. From reference to care over the tongue the Psalmist passes on here to speak of conduct generally, and this under two divisions, the first of these having the widest possible reference, and the other special reference to the cultivation of peace. In the former of these divisions the parallelism is that of negative and positive statements of the duty of obeying the will of God: we are to "bend, or turn, out of moral evil," and we are to "do good,"—"evil" and "good" being both obviously used with the broadest reference. Very similar in substance and in form are Isaiah's "Cease to do evil, learn to do well" (i. 16, 17), and Paul's "Abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good" (Rom. xii. 9).—According to the most probable reading, the conjunction δέ is inserted by the apostle after ἐκκλινάτω. The thought in Peter's mind which the particle expresses would seem to be, "*but* remember that good words must be supported by good works." So slight, however, is its adversative power here, that English idiom hardly permits us to translate it at all.—The closing injunction of the series has regard to peace in a very wide use of the word, peace in all the societies and relations with which we are concerned or on which we can exert influence: cf. Heb. xii. 14; Rom. xii. 18. The parallelism here is climactic: we are to "seek" peace as a thing of the highest value, and which at the same time needs diligent search to find it,—yea, we are to "pursue" it, as a thing which amid the excitements and tumults of life is very apt to take to flight.

Ver. 12. This verse gives the ground of the assurance that the man who desires happiness will find it in doing the will of God: "because God sees and cares for the righteous, and sees also the wicked." That His seeing the wicked carries with it condemnation and punishment, is left to the mind of the reader. The particle ὅτι is introduced into the quotation by the apostle himself, the sentence standing in the LXX., as in the Hebrew, without any formal connection with what precedes. The parallelism in the Psalm here is that of a quatrain, each of the two main statements having attached to

it a sister statement, which elucidates the primary one by setting forth explicitly the nature and issues of the divine "seeing," in the one gracious and helpful, in the other stern and punitory. "The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, —and His ears toward their cry: the face of the Lord is upon them that do evil,—to cut off the remembrance of them from the earth." In his citation Peter leaves out the last clause, and the abruptness thus produced has in its suggestiveness a peculiarly solemn effect.

Many expositors have endeavoured to find in the clause, "The face of the Lord is upon them that do evil," an express statement of the difference of the character of this looking from that of His looking upon the righteous. They lay stress on the substitution here of "face," for "eyes" of the other clause,—regarding "face" as, from O. T. usage, a word fitted of itself to indicate the idea of displeasure. There are certainly a number of passages in O. T. (*e.g.* Gen. iv. 5, xxxi. 2) in which the word פָּנִים (*πρόσωπον*, LXX.) occurs in connection with statements regarding the exhibition of anger; and in two places where the divine "face" is spoken of, the thought intended is clearly shown by the context to be of such a kind that in our English versions the word "anger" is used instead of "face" (Ps. xxi. 9 and Lam. iv. 16),—in the latter place Luther also having *Zorn*, and De Wette *Zornblick*. Still, with regard to "the countenance of God," a use of the expression like this is quite exceptional, and in these cases the idea of anger does not lie in the word itself, but merely in the connection. Beyond doubt, from the *ordinary* use of the term with reference to God (Num. vi. 26; Ps. iv. 6, xi. 7, xxi. 6, etc.), grace and joy are the ideas which would most readily associate themselves with the expression, taken simply by itself. Neither can anything be made of the preposition *ἐπί* in the way of establishing an *express* difference of meaning between the third clause and the first. It is true that, as employed in these clauses, *ἐπί* represents different Hebrew prepositions, in the first clause אֶל, and in the third

פְּנֵי; but there does not seem reason to think that any unfavourable sense lies in פְּנֵי taken simply by itself, and the meaning appears to be, "the face of the Lord is with (present with) evil-doers." The Revisers of our A. V. have undoubtedly done right in using one word, "upon," as the rendering of ἐπί in both clauses, instead of the contrasted "over" and "against" of the A. V. On the whole, it seems clear that in the third clause of the verse and the first alike the one thought which is expressed is that God *sees* the righteous, *sees* the wicked. The contrast, slightly indicated by the adversative conjunction δέ, is left to be fully presented to the mind by the marked absence in the last clause of anything answering to the gracious words as to "the ears of the Lord being toward the prayer of the righteous,"—by the naturally suggested remembrance of the following clause in the Psalm, which is here omitted,—and, generally, by the knowledge we all have, through conscience and revelation, of God's hatred of sin.

Vv. 13–17. *On duty under persecution.*

At this point the apostle passes by an easy and natural transition into a new and important section of the practical part of the Epistle, dealing with the difficulties and trials to which Christians are exposed, as placed in the midst of a hostile world. To this subject there have been references in the previous part (i. 6, 7, ii. 12, 15), such as to show that from the beginning the writer's mind was much occupied with it; and in this division on which we now enter he gives with regard to it very full advices and consolations. This section may be said to extend to the close of the body of the Epistle, that is, to v. 11; for though in some places the apostle's observations and counsels have a general reference, yet there is distinct evidence that the special requirements of a *suffering* Christian community were throughout prominently before his mind.

Ver. 13. The question introduced by *καί* gives in a vivid form an additional conclusion to that which the readers are assumed to have already drawn from the *data* stated by the Psalmist, or, more exactly, sets forth with special distinctness one element in that conclusion which they were prone to overlook; thus, "The passage which has been quoted tells you—and you believe it—that the secret of a happy life is to do the will of God, for God is looking down on the moral life of the world, and certainly will bless the righteous. And observe, as a part which you are apt to forget of the same general truth, that, under the providence of your omniscient and almighty Father, no one, however much he may hate you, can do you real harm." To link on a question by "and" to what has preceded is most natural, and this mode of expression is probably found occasionally in every language, the immediate connection being often with some thought not stated, but obviously suggested by the previous course of remark, and the logical relation of the question to what has gone before being very varied. The use of *καί* in this way is common in classical Greek, and occurs now and then in N. T., *e.g.* Mark x. 26; Luke x. 29; cf. Winer, p. 545. — In his question the apostle puts *κακώσων* and *τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ* in sharp antithesis, appealing to his readers, as it were, in this way: "Is it not your fixed belief that under the government of a righteous God *ἀγαθόν* in the sense of 'physical good' will certainly in the long run attach itself to *ἀγαθόν* in the sense of 'moral good,' and *κακόν*, 'physical evil,' to *κακόν*, 'moral evil'? If, then, ye be zealous pursuers of what is morally good, how can you think that you are to be subjected to physical evil?" *Κακώσων* is evidently used, therefore, with a very wide reference, the chief thought in it having respect to permanent harm, as to which there is an absolute declaration that, given the required condition of zealously following good, the thing cannot possibly be,—with a glance besides, however, at the truth that, with respect even to the earthly sources of quietness and comfort in life, good is as a rule

visible, and not evil, in the dealings of God's providence towards His people, for "when a man's ways please the Lord, He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him" (Prov. xvi. 7). As regards this latter aspect of the case, however, there are, in God's wisdom and kindness, for the higher good of the individual Christians immediately concerned and the quickening of the Church as a whole, many exceptions; and to the fact, which he knew to be with much vividness before the minds of his readers, that not improbably the lot of some of them might be among the exceptions, the apostle proceeds in the following verse to draw attention.

Considering not merely the formal similarity, but the close resemblance or indeed identity in the course of thought, it seems very likely that, in the first clause of the verse before us, the apostle had present to his mind the first clause of Isa. l. 9, given in the LXX. thus: *ἰδοὺ κύριος κύριος βοηθήσει μοι· τίς κακώσει με;* By the apostle's form of the question, in which the participle with the article is used, we have set before us expressly what the simple question, "Who will work you evil?" would have but suggested in a remote way, —namely that, as the apostle was aware, this thought of coming evil was one which was already seriously occupying and agitating the minds of his readers. The grammatical subject of the sentence is *ὁ κακώσων*; thus, "The man who is to do you harm, the harm-doer whom I know you are with some dread looking for, who is he?"

The clause, "If ye be zealous of good," whilst, as has been seen, suggesting an argument through the antithesis between *κακώσων* and *ἀγαθοῦ*, at the same time reminds the readers, solemnly and impressively, of the only condition on which they had any reasonable ground to look for God's keeping them from evil. The clause is, in fact, an expanded statement of that connection between this sentence and the preceding quotation which has been already indicated by *καί*; for *τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταί* at once leads back the mind to the central precept of the quotation, *ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν* (ver. 11). By the

article in τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ the various forms of moral excellence which have been spoken of separately in vv. 10, 11, are summed up and presented as a unity, "good," "that which is good." By many scholars τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ has been taken as masculine. With the reading of the T. R., μιμηταί in place of ζηλωταί, there was in favour of this view the argument that in every one of the other passages in N. T. where μιμητής is found—six in all—its construction is with a genitive of the *person*; cf. *e.g.* 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 14. Considering, however, the very great likelihood that in τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ we are to recognise a reference to ἀγαθόν of ver. 11, there seems to be good reason to think that, even supposing μιμηταί to be the correct reading, the adjective is neuter. The verb μιμεῖσθαι is in Heb. xiii. 7 followed by an accusative of the *thing*, and in 3 John 11 its object is the neuter of the same word found here (τὸ ἀγαθόν); and the substantive might be similarly connected. Again, whilst "the wicked one" is a frequent N. T. designation of Satan, and "the Just One" seems to have been well known as a designation of the Saviour (cf. iii. 18, note), there is no evidence—for our Lord's words in Matt. xix. 17 obviously prove nothing with regard to usage—that the name "the Good One" was a mode of expression in use for God or Christ. Ζηλωταί, however, has much better support than μιμηταί, and with it there is no argument at all for taking ἀγαθοῦ as masculine, seeing that ζηλωτής is in N. T. attached as freely to a genitive of the thing as of the person. It is not unlikely, as Alford suggests, that the reading μιμηταί may have arisen from a reminiscence, in the mind of some copyist, of the passage already referred to in 3 John. — On ζηλωταί as here used, cf. particularly Tit. ii. 14.

The verb γένησθε, as here employed, does not, according to N. T. usage, imply or suggest that the apostle doubted whether at the present time his readers were "zealous of good." Writing to them as Christians, he could not but assume that they were in some degree what their profession declared; and

the employment of *γίγνεσθαι* instead of *εἶναι* is, in accordance with a frequent Scripture usage in such cases, based on the fact that, so long as men are on earth, all Christian attainment is imperfect, and that therefore believers must always be "becoming" in higher measure what already to a certain extent they "are;" cf. *e.g.* John xv. 8; Rom. xii. 16; Phil. iii. 17. On the untenableness of the rigid view maintained by some scholars regarding the meaning of *γίγνεσθαι* in N. T., cf. Huther on Jas. i. 22. Huther's remarks bear specially on the use of the imperative, but his proof is really applicable to any part of the verb when employed of Christian character in a communication addressed to Christians.

Another view of the force of this verse than that which has now been given is possible. The verse may be held not to be a corollary from the positions laid down in the quotation which the apostle has made from the 34th Psalm, but a new thought, similar to that already given in ii. 12, which comes in again in the 16th verse of the present chapter: "If ye are seen to be plainly and perseveringly given to the pursuit of what is good, who will do you harm?—who, indeed, will not rather, through your exhibition of a character which in some degree even the mere natural conscience recognises as beautiful, be won to regard you with favour and kindliness?" Cf. *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, i. 3, *ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς,—καὶ οὐχ ἕξετε ἐχθρόν*. Even in an age when Christians were exposed to no little suspicion and trouble for their religion, and when positive persecution seemed to be not improbable, or had indeed begun, a general statement like this of what, on the whole, would be found to be the case throughout the history of the Church might naturally and helpfully be made. It would fit in, too, quite well with what follows. But there seem to be objections to this interpretation. *First*, a question introduced as this is by *καί* appears to require a closer connection with what precedes than would be given on this view, according to which the leading thought is of the judgement of men, and the idea of Divine Providence

is secondary. *Secondly*, this view destroys, or at least makes remote, the similarity of meaning in the verse to that of the first clause of Isa. l. 9, which (see above) seems to have been in the apostle's mind. *Thirdly*, a thought like that supposed —which, though similar to that expressed in ii. 12, is at the same time somewhat different from it, and, for persons situated as the first readers of the Epistle were, was perhaps a somewhat more difficult one to entertain—would hardly have been given in the brief and abrupt form in which this short verse would present it, but would have been expanded a little. *Fourthly*, the intensity which lies in the word ζηλωταί appears to suggest rather that in the mind of the writer the relation between his readers and the eye of God was vividly present, than that he was thinking of their conduct as looked on by men. These objections taken together appear sufficient to show that this view of the meaning of the verse is unlikely. Neither can we well combine the interpretations. Whilst perfectly consistent with each other, they are not so related as that we can very naturally suppose a writer to have intended to express both thoughts by the same words.

Ver. 14*a*. The division of verses here is not happy. The second clause of ver. 14 introduces a new thought, and ought to have been thrown into another verse, which should have gone on to ὑμῶν in ver. 15.

In the first clause of ver. 14 the apostle deals with an apparent exception to the general position laid down in the previous verse; an exception to which, as he knew, the minds of his readers, situated as they were, would immediately turn, —their thoughts on the subject having been, indeed, already pointed to in the definiteness of ὁ κακώσων. "I have said that those who serve God will not be harmed; and that assurance, absolute with regard to ultimate issues, includes also a declaration that, as a rule, here on earth, the hand of their enemies will be restrained. But supposing that the case were to occur which to human vision seems most opposed to this assurance,—supposing that you were to suffer because

of your faithfully doing the will of God, — still you are blessed, still there is no κάκωσις other than according to a superficial application of the word."

On the use of εἰ καί and καὶ εἰ, see iii. 1, note. In English "even if" is frequently used a little loosely, not merely for the case to which it properly belongs, where the supposition made is represented as in itself unlikely (καὶ εἰ), but for that, as here, where the supposition may in itself be a probable one, but the case supposed is difficult to reconcile with the apodosis (εἰ καί). — On the construction of εἰ with the optative, rare in N. T., as indeed is the optative mood in any connection, see Winer, p. 367; A. Buttmann, p. 223; Jelf, § 855. What this construction exhibits is merely the supposition of a thing as possible, with perhaps also, in the instance before us, according to a frequent use of this form, a suggestion of possible repetition. In the present case, too, and in ver. 17, we have, as Mr. Sheldon Green remarks (*Gram.* p. 162), illustrations of a tendency found in Greek writers, in accordance with the general sweetness and delicacy of Greek style, to use this particular form of hypothesis, expressing mere possibility, for a supposition of a distressing kind. — The verb πάσχειν is a favourite one with our apostle, being in this short Epistle used by him oftener than it is by any other N. T. writer. His transition to this word in the present verse is probably due to a distinct intention to intimate that "suffering" is not κακοῦσθαι in the sense in which mainly he had employed that verb in the previous verse; also, perhaps, to remove the thoughts of his readers from a mode of expression in which the human agents in causing the suffering were directly suggested to the mind, to a word more general in its reference, fitted rather to lead the heart to look to God, under whose providence the trouble came. — In διὰ δικαιοσύνην there is possibly still a reference to the passage quoted from the Psalm, the fact that "the eyes of the Lord are ἐπὶ δικαίους" having been made prominent in the close of the quotation. Certainly, however, in

this expression, taken in association with μακάριοι and with the general force of the clause, we cannot fail to recognise an echo of one of the beatitudes (Matt. v. 10). Turned to often, no doubt, by all the apostles for strength and cheer, that declaration of the Lord, one naturally thinks, must have graven itself specially on the heart of Peter, considering the intimation which had been given to him by Jesus Himself that he was to die by martyrdom. — To μακάριοι the mind at once supplies the present indicative ἐστέ. Some scholars (as Webster and Wilkinson) supply ἂν εἴητε, the mode of expression required for a rigidly formal apodosis in a hypothetical sentence introduced by εἰ with the optative. The ellipsis of these words, however, in any writer is exceedingly unlikely (Jelf, § 376); and even if the supplement were a defensible one, the construction thus obtained is opposed to the usage of the N. T., for nowhere in it is there a complete hypothetical sentence of the optative form. The force of the great statement presented by μακάριοι would be weakened, too, by this form of the copula. — Here, as in the beatitudes, and indeed generally throughout the N. T., μακάριος is mainly *objective* in its reference, intimating the existence of the grounds of happiness, whether or not these are at the time in any large measure subjectively apprehended and the sense of happiness felt. The true Christian is "blessed" even when through feebleness of faith he is not consciously full of bliss. On the "blessedness" of those who are persecuted for Christ's sake, cf. Luke vi. 22, 23; Acts v. 41; Phil. i. 28, 29; 2 Tim. ii. 12.

Vv. 14β, 15α. A warning, in close connection with μακάριοι, against yielding to fear under threatened or actual persecution. "But remember that this blessedness can come only to those who persevere in the way of righteousness. Therefore, whatever persecutions may be threatened or brought upon you by the enemies of the truth, do not yield to fear, but glorify Jesus as your Lord and the Lord of the universe, by cleaving to Him in persistent holy obedience, and by childlike faith in His gracious guardianship."

The apostle here, as so often, adopts O. T. words as the vesture of his thought, applying them freely. The passage used is Isa. viii. 12, 13, as given by LXX. The prophet is there reporting words which had been spoken to him by God Himself, commanding him and His other true servants in the nation not to share in those terrors of invasion which were entertained by the people around them, but to cleave in simplicity of faith to God.—As used by the apostle, the pronoun *αὐτῶν* (which may either have been substituted by him for *αὐτοῦ* of the LXX., or may have been in his copy, *αὐτῶν* being found in some MSS.) refers obviously to those enemies who, in the word *πάσχοιτε*, are implicitly pointed to as the agents in the suffering of the Christians. On this occasional use of *αὐτός* in N. T. in relation to an antecedent not expressed but readily suggested,—a mode of expression which has abundant analogies in free conversational style in any language,—cf. Winer, p. 182, A. Buttmann, p. 106.—In Isaiah the command is plainly, "Do not fear the fear which they entertain." As regards the grammar, this implies that *φόβον φοβηθῆτε* is the construction of the cognate accusative, and that the governed genitive falls under the possessive class. As the words are applied by Peter, the general meaning is quite clear, but the precise nature of the construction doubtful. Taking it exactly as in LXX., the sense would be, "Do not permit yourselves to cherish the same fear which your persecutors do"—namely, fear of fines, prisons, bodily tortures, which, because they themselves fear them, they think will be instruments to subdue your faith, and therefore employ against you. This construction brings out the sense in what, for Peter's purpose, seems too remote and indirect a way. Again, *αὐτῶν* may be taken in an objective relation to *φόβον*, "fear not the fear of them," *i.e.* simply, "do not be at all afraid of them." In this case the definiteness in *τόν* would be, "the fear which you know to exist in some measure in your hearts" (cf. John vii. 13). Perhaps again, though not very naturally, taking *αὐτῶν* subjectively, "their fear" might mean, "the

fear which they endeavour to inspire in you;" but more probably, if *αὐτῶν* be viewed as having this force, the objective sense of *φόβον* would have to be supposed, "the instrument or cause of fear," *i.e.* the cruelty or persecution itself,—"the (instrument of) terror which they employ" (cf. Ps. xci. [xc. Sept.] 5, where, however, the construction is different, *φοβηθήσῃ ἀπὸ φόβου*). This last view of the construction seems to be that represented by the rendering of our A. V., "Be not afraid of their terror;" whilst the Revisers, who have "Fear not their fear," appear to adopt the construction first mentioned, the same as in Isaiah. Perhaps preferable to either is that given second above, yielding simply the sense, "Do not be at all afraid of them." On the construction, cf. iii. 6, note.—By *μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε* the mind is carried forward to think of the agitation, distractions, surgings to and fro of thought and feeling, which are brought on by strong fear, and which tend to impede all the exercises of spiritual religion, and to overthrow that restfulness of heart in God which should characterize the Christian. On the force of *ταράσσεσθαι* here, cf. John xiv. 1, 27.

In the second clause of the quotation the apostle deviates in a most striking and interesting way from the language of Isaiah. The prophet's words are, "Sanctify Jehovah of Hosts Himself," which the LXX., according to the oldest texts, gives in the abridged form *Κύριον αὐτὸν ἁγιάσατε*. In place of *αὐτόν*, Peter has substituted *τὸν Χριστόν* (for the authority for this reading over *τὸν Θεόν* of the T. R. is quite decisive). This is perhaps the most remarkable of several instances in which textual criticism, whilst it has removed from the text or has somewhat affected the weight of certain proof passages for the divinity of our Lord, has brought into view others which were formerly hidden. Nothing more impressive with respect to the belief and teaching of the inspired apostle on this head could be conceived than, in a distinct quotation from the O. T., his deliberately writing in place of the great name, "The LORD of Hosts Himself," "the LORD Christ."

The construction of the clause is a little doubtful. There is no grammatical objection to our taking *Κύριον*, though anarthrous, in immediate connection with *τὸν Χριστόν*, "the Lord Christ," on the analogy of the common LXX. combination *Κύριος ὁ Θεός* (*e.g.* Gen. ii. 4, 15, 16), which is found also a number of times in the Apocalypse (*e.g.* xix. 6, xxii. 5). As, however, the apostle introduces after *Κύριον* the particle δέ, whilst neither the LXX. nor the Heb. has any connective, it seems as if his mind rested for a moment specially on *Κύριον*; and it appears likely, therefore, that the form of his thought was that which accords with ordinary Greek usage in a sentence expressed like the present,—that is to say, that *Κύριον* is predicate, having peculiar emphasis from its position at the head of the clause (cf. i. 17, *πατέρα*). The meaning accordingly is, "Sanctify the Christ in your hearts as Lord."

As here employed, *ἁγιάζω* obviously means "set apart, enshrined as the object of supreme, absolute reverence, as free from all defilement and possessed of all excellence." This sense of the verb springs immediately from the familiar use of the adjective in application to God; but it is not found very often. The only case in N. T. precisely similar to the present is in the Lord's Prayer, *ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου* (Matt. vi. 9; Luke xi. 2). In LXX. also this application of *ἁγιάζω* to God occurs occasionally; *e.g.* besides the passage of Isaiah here quoted, Isa. xxix. 23; Deut. xxxii. 51. It is plain that by sin of any kind, and in a very marked way by faithless terror at the threats or under the persecutions of Christ's enemies, by compromise with them, by apostasy, His professed friends profane His name, displaying practically a lack of remembrance of His claims to be constantly obeyed by them and trusted with childlike faith. On the other hand, all true service, and with peculiar distinctness stedfast adherence to His cause under the trial of persecution, evinces intelligent and loving reverence for Christ, "sanctifies" Him. The predicative addition *Κύριον* brings out with great emphasis that position of Jesus, in relation to the

believer himself and to the world, which the wise Christian will have much before his mind and heart,—his rightful and gracious King, who is at the same time Lord of the universe, controlling all things with absolute sway, and making all things work together for good to them that love Him.—To the quotation which he makes from Isaiah, the apostle adds mention of the shrine in which the "hallowing" of Christ is to take place—"in your hearts." Considering the connection in which these words occur, one may reasonably think that the apostle, in thus reminding his readers of the spiritual nature of true religion, intended to suggest to them this thought in particular, that, amid the tumults and the terrors of the world, strength was to be obtained by turning the eyes away from the strifes and confusions of earth, and communing with the Saviour in the secret fellowship of faith. Peter well remembered that it was when he looked away from Jesus to survey the billows that he feared, and began to sink.

Ver. 15*β*. By some expositors (so A. V.) a new sentence or independent clause is begun here, with the imperative ἔστε understood. But when we consider the naturalness with which the words of this clause can be viewed as grammatically dependent on what immediately precedes, and the fact that participial constructions are specially favoured by our apostle, there seems good reason—strong in any case, and especially strong where the reading without the connective particle is adopted—to take the construction intended by the writer as being ἕτοιμοι (ὄντες). According to this view, the clause constitutes an epexegesis of the precept, "Sanctify Christ as Lord," by attaching an explicit statement of one important element in that sanctifying, "being ready always to give a vindication to every one who asks of you a statement with regard to the hope which is in you,—but being careful to do this with meekness and reverence." The "hallowing of Christ in the heart" by devotion to His will and faith in His protection, will, among Christians placed

in the midst of opponents, show itself prominently in an unflinching readiness to confess Him, and this in all circumstances and to every kind of questioner (*ἀεὶ, παντί*), whether magistrate on the tribunal or acquaintance in the common intercourse of life,—provided only that in his inquiry he appear in some measure sincere, and not obviously a mere profane and frivolous or malignant caviller (Matt. vii. 6). The statement (*λόγος*) which is asked for from the Christian will be given, and will not be any hazy combination of sentences meant mainly to propitiate foes by hiding the characteristics of Christianity, but will take the form of a frank defence of Christianity (*ἀπολογία*, "a reasoning away" of misconceptions). The duty of thus giving a defence when questioned is plainly represented by the apostle as one incumbent on *every* believer. There is really involved in the apostle's precept here, therefore, an exhortation to all Christians to seek growth in knowledge, to "*study* to answer" (Prov. xv. 28),—so as to be able, at least, to point out in a simple way some outstanding features of the evidence for the truth of their religion.

According to the reading of T. R., which inserts *δέ* after *ἕτοιμοι*, the present clause would seem not to stand in an immediate exegetical relation to *ἁγιάσατε*, but to be a correction of a misconception; thus: "Not, however, in your 'hallowing of Christ' by completeness of trust, disdaining to regard in any way the thoughts of your opponents about you and about your Lord; *but*, on the contrary, being ready to answer their inquiries." But there is ample MS. authority for omitting *δέ*, which has slipped into the text possibly through some thought of simplifying the period a little by introducing here a new sentence, with the imperative as a supplement.—The construction *ἕτοιμος πρός*, quite classical, occurs also in Tit. iii. 1.—*Αἰτοῦντι* is governed by *ἀπολογίαν*, through the force of the cognate verb, which is felt to lie in a measure in the substantive, *ἀπολογεῖσθαι* being construed with a dative (Acts xix. 33; 2 Cor. xii. 19). A construction

like this, while perfectly natural, is not very common either with classical writers or in N. T.; cf. another case with *ἀπολογία*, 1 Cor. ix. 3, and with *εὐχαριστία*, 2 Cor. ix. 11, 12; and see Winer, p. 264; A. Buttmann, p. 180.—On the distinction between the constructions *παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι* (= *παντὶ ὅστις αἰτεῖ*) and *παντὶ αἰτοῦντι*, see Winer, p. 138. —On *λόγος*, as here used, cf. iv. 5; Rom. xiv. 12.

A reader feels that "hope" is exactly the word which answers to the conditions of the case. Faith, of which the Christians often spoke, would seem to the heathen around to describe merely certain views or speculations on religion, kindred in origin and in measure of trustworthiness to the multitudes of products of fancy or of mental subtlety on this subject which were to be heard or read of in that age. This "faith" might interest philosophers, but men in general were not likely to be particularly curious with regard to it. But the "hope" of Christians,—a hope, as no doubt many heathen with whom believers were brought into contact understood in a vague way, of seeing the return in glory of Jesus who had been crucified, and of receiving through Him an inheritance of blessedness,—this hope, when manifest and vivid, sustaining the Christian under obvious and severe trials, was a practical power, which could not but attract the attention and excite the interest of every beholder of the slightest thoughtfulness. The form, therefore, it is reasonable to suppose, which a request made to believers for information about their religion would take, would, in a very large proportion of cases, set their "hope" in the foreground; and specially on it the "defence" would be made to bear.

The last clause of the verse is cautionary, "But see to it that in all your defences of your religion the spirit of that religion be maintained: let your vindications of truth be given with nothing of arrogance, nor in a flippant, careless way, as if by men of a superior caste; but, on the contrary, with meekness, and with that thoughtful, holy reverence which beseems a pleading on such a subject."—On "meekness," cf.

iii. 4, note. By *φόβος* here does not seem to be meant "reverence" for those placed by Providence in a position of authority, as in ii. 18, iii. 2; because, while no doubt the precept of the verse includes a reference to defences made before magistrates, it is in form quite general. Neither does the sense "the fear of God," taken simply, quite suit the connection with *μετά*, or the co-ordinate association of *φόβου* with *πραΰτητος*. The idea intended appears rather to be that expressed in the paraphrase just given, "reverence" of feeling and manner, such as becomes the solemn importance of the subject dealt with, and the momentous consequences which may result from the statement made. This reverential feeling is obviously an immediate outflow from, or a special manifestation of, the fear of God. The best commentary on this little cautionary clause is to be found in Col. iv. 5, 6. Wiesinger well cites Luther's fine paraphrase of it, based on his own experience at Worms and elsewhere: "Then must ye not answer with proud words, and state your cause with defiance and with violence, as if ye would tear up trees; but with such fear and humility as if ye stood before God's judgement-seat, . . . so must thou stand in fear, and not rely on thine own strength, but on the word and promise of Christ, Matt. x. 19, 20."

Ver. 16. The participle here may be taken either as co-ordinate with *ἕτοιμοι* (*ὄντες*) of the previous verse, or as subordinate to it. In the former case, the two clauses together are attached to *ἁγιάσατε* and expand its thought; in the latter case, *ἔχοντες* brings in a most important reminder of a cautionary kind in connection with readiness to answer inquiries. This latter view seems the preferable. The clause *ἕτοιμοι κτλ.*, whilst epexegetical of *ἁγιάσατε*, obviously does not illustrate the central principle or essence of the "hallowing of Christ," but draws attention to a mode in which the spirit of resolution to hallow Him will show itself. But "having a good conscience" lies in the very essence of "hallowing Christ," and the present clause therefore hardly associates itself in a natural way

with the preceding as co-ordinate. On the other hand, when taken as grammatically subordinate, it fits in perfectly. Having enjoined readiness to answer inquiries, and—in a somewhat incidental way, as is shown by his treating the words as a parenthesis—introduced the caution with respect to "meekness and reverence," the apostle now proceeds: "remembering always the transcendent importance, in order that your defences of Christianity may benefit men and glorify God, of your not allowing your sufferings under persecution to lead you to make in your conduct any compromise with sin, but having the words with which you defend your religion sustained by a consistently holy life." If the view suggested in the notes on ver. 11, above, of the force of the δέ which the apostle interjects into his quotation, be correct, then the relation between vv. 10 and 11 affords a close parallel to that here between vv. 15 and 16.

On συνείδησιν, cf. ii. 19, note. Where a moral quality is ascribed to συνείδησις, as here ἀγαθή (also ver. 21; Acts xxiii. 1; 1 Tim. i. 5, 19; καλή, Heb. xiii. 18; καθαρά, 1 Tim. iii. 9; 2 Tim. i. 3; ἀπρόσκοπος, Acts xxiv. 16; πονηρά, Heb. x. 22), what is prominent in thought is plainly "conscience," as the power bound to govern, and not simply "consciousness," as something passive. "A good conscience" is one which, enlightened by the teaching of God's Spirit, is truthful and distinct in its utterances, and vigorous in its pressure on the will. In every Christian it has defects, no doubt. Not even in the most mature believer has the conscience perfect clearness of vision, perfect articulateness of utterance, perfect energy. But God recognises as "a good conscience" one which aims with full honesty to do His will; cf. Heb. xiii. 18.—In the latter part of the verse the motive which is suggested for "keeping a good conscience" is that, through the steady persistence of Christians in well-doing, their enemies, who from a partial acquaintance with their life misjudged them and spoke calumnies against them, might be made ashamed. Now this effect could be produced only by

what was seen, by the workings in the outer life of a healthy conscience, and therefore it may perhaps seem to us that it would have been more natural for the apostle to speak expressly of the visible fruits of piety, saying, as in the precisely parallel passage ii. 12, "having your *life* beautiful." The bearings and effects of "keeping a good conscience," taking that expression strictly, are simply subjective. To obtain a correct view of Peter's purpose in using the words which he has done, however, and thus be able to see their aptness and the beauty and richness of his teaching in the passage, we must bring the last words of the verse into association with the first. The *ἀγαθήν* attached to *ἀναστροφήν* reduplicates on the *ἀγαθήν* attached to *συνείδησιν*; and the apostle here in most condensed language gives his readers the reminder that true excellence of life can be produced only through the workings of a soul made pure and holy, the firm government of an enlightened healthy conscience. The use of the words "having a good conscience" is obviously fitted to suggest also, and perhaps was chosen by the apostle in order to suggest another motive, of a subjective kind, besides that relating to influence on others which he has expressed in the latter part of the verse,—this motive, namely, "that in your defences of Christianity you may have genuine comfort, and that their reflex influence on your own spiritual life may be strengthening and elevating."

On the thought conveyed by the latter part of the verse, and on the use of *ἐν ᾧ*, cf. ii. 12, notes. From assimilation to the text of the parallel in that verse has no doubt arisen the various reading here, *καταλαλοῦσιν* (or *καταλαλῶσιν*,—found as a variant also in that passage) *ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν*, in place of the simple *καταλαλεῖσθε*, given by Codex B, and otherwise well supported.—On *καταισχυνθῶσιν*, cf. ii. 6.—On *ἐπηρεάζοντες*, cf. Luke vi. 28, where, as here, the verb governs an accusative,—whilst by the classical writers it is construed generally with a dative, sometimes with a genitive. There seems, particularly judging from a definition given by Aris-

totle (*Rhet.* ii. 2), to be involved in the sense of this word, not thoughtless misrepresentation or insult merely, but an element of meanness and malignity. Its force as used here, therefore, would seem to be not simply "traduce," but "enviously traduce."—By ἐν Χριστῷ, "which you maintain in Christ" (*i.e.* "through your union to Him"), the apostle links the end of the long period closely to the great precept with which it began, "Hallow in your hearts Christ as Lord." It is as if he said, "Remember that your ἀγαθὴ ἀναστροφή, which your enemies deride and traduce, is in and through Christ,—is, in fact, the great distinctive mark in you of His presence and power. It is then by faithful, persistent continuance in this blameless and useful life that you will most impressively prove that you hallow Christ as Lord."

Ver. 17. The connection intimated by γάρ is with συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθήν; and by the verse, looked at in this connection, we have substantially brought before us again the theme of the whole passage, which was given us at the beginning in ver. 14, "If ye should suffer for righteousness' sake, ye are blessed,"—a position exceedingly difficult for human nature to accept, needing therefore iteration and reiteration, and as a matter of fact set forth in Scripture in manifold ways and aspects. The form in which the thought is presented here is very similar to that found in ii. 19, 20. Κρεῖττον replies to the feeling of impatience which, in unguarded moments, is so apt to rise in a Christian soul under persecution, and which in a vague way tends to this utterance, "The treatment would seem less hard to me, if I had a sense of having deserved it by misconduct." "Let any thought of this kind be far from you," says the apostle; "it is better, immeasurably better, every way (*beatius infinitis modis*, Bengel), if it should be God's will to have you suffer, that you suffer in and for well-doing, than in and for evil-doing,—better, whether you regard immediately the glorifying of your Father in heaven, or your own spiritual peace and welfare under the trouble, or healthful influence on the world,—better both as respects the present and the future." On the

rhetorical understatement (λιτότης) in κρεῖττον (the thought which the apostle really intends to send home being, of course, that suffering for evil-doing has in it nothing at all of good, but the very reverse), cf. the use of ἀρκετός in iv. 3, with note. —The use of κρεῖττον here, in which the word obviously includes both the notion of moral excellence and that of happiness, is as in 1 Cor. vii. 9, 38, xi. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 21.—On the supplement in the apodosis, κρεῖττόν (ἐστι), and on the construction εἰ θέλοι, cf. iii. 14, notes.

In the use of both θέλημα and θέλοι in the clause there is not really anything of pleonasm, the thought in the substantive being of an energy considered simply as existent, in the verb that of a special action of the energy,—in the one of a fountain, in the other of an outflow from it: cf. τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, Eph. i. 11; and see Winer, p. 755. The mode of expression is evidently intended to direct attention very prominently to the fact that suffering does not come through any blind chance, but through a Will, guided by infinite goodness and infinite wisdom; and therefore that, seeing God has sent it, and is looking down on everything connected with it, His people, suffering for doing right, may well restrain all murmuring, cleave to Him in holy obedience, and feel assured of a happy issue.—Seeing that out of the infinitive clause, which is the subject of κρεῖττόν (ἐστι), we have to supply, as the object of θέλοι, not the whole ἀγαθοποιοῦντας πάσχειν, but simply πάσχειν, rigid exactness might have required ὑμᾶς πάσχειν to be expressed after θέλοι; but this would have clogged the sentence, and there is no real ambiguity.—The question arises whether the participles in their relation to πάσχειν are intended to intimate concomitance merely or cause, "*while* doing well, *while* doing evil," or "*for* doing well, *for* doing evil;" cf. ἀγαθοποιοῦντες καὶ πάσχοντες, ii. 20, note. Looking to the feeling possibly arising in the minds of some Christians under persecution, to which this verse appears to be meant as a reply (see above), there seems no reason to doubt that the causal relation, "*for*," was upper-

most in the apostle's mind, though he has chosen to put the case more generally.

Vv. 18–iv. 6. *Proof from the case of the Lord Jesus, that suffering in flesh for righteousness' sake brings quickening in spirit; and exhortation to the believers, based on this, to bear persecution patiently, and let no hostility of the world turn them away from persistent pursuit of holiness.*

This paragraph has some grave difficulties of interpretation. Its relation to the context and its general aim, however, are sufficiently clear. The introductory particle ὅτι indicates that the exhortation begun in ver. 13 to patient endurance of persecution for righteousness' sake, and, in particular, the summary statement of ver. 17, that "it is better to suffer as well-doers than as evil-doers," are here supported, the support being by appeal to the example of Christ in yielding Himself to suffering and death for a holy and gracious end. That this course of thought is continued is shown by iv. 1, which expressly makes a practical application of the Saviour's example in suffering; and out of the exhortation given in that verse the observations in vv. 2–6 arise, though in the latter part with some obscurity as regards the precise connection, which has to be considered in the detailed exegesis there. Throughout the whole passage the apostle has prominently before his mind the relations to each other, and the comparative importance, of the two elements in the human constitution, and the two spheres of life and interest to which thus man belongs,—the bodily, material, σάρξ, and the spiritual, πνεῦμα. We find these set in antithesis in the first verse of the section (iii. 18), and again in the last verse (iv. 6); whilst at the middle also (iv. 1) we trace the presence of the same contrast, the formal addition to παθών twice of σαρκί not being explicable in a natural way except on the supposition of an implied reference to the bearing which "suffering in flesh" has on "energy and

happiness in spirit." Seeing then that this antithesis has so evidently determined to a considerable extent the apostle's line of remark, it may be considered with justice to be the key to the interpretation of the paragraph, in so far as, in so complicated a passage, any single thought can serve as a key.

Ver. 18. Reference to Christ's example as a Sufferer brings up of necessity to every Christian mind thought also of the gracious purpose of His suffering. Here therefore, as in the similar passage, ii. 21–25, the apostle is naturally led to touch upon this. It is very interesting to see in these references the intense adoring thankfulness with which, through the teaching of the Spirit, the sufferings of Jesus had come to be looked upon by that disciple who, when these were prophetically intimated to him, said with horror, "Be it far from Thee, Lord; this shall not be unto Thee" (Matt. xvi. 21, 22). —The line of thought in its barest form is, "You are called on as Christians to suffer, and it is a good thing for you thus to suffer in well-doing, for Christ, our great Exemplar,—whom to follow is always good, and always brings good,—suffered for well-doing." But from the outset we have the reference made detailed,—"Because Christ died" (or "suffered,"—see Critical Notes) "for sins once, a Righteous One for unrighteous, that He might bring us to God."

Ἅπαξ has evidently an emphasis, "once and no more," "once for all;" cf. Jude 3, and particularly the use of the compound *ἐφάπαξ* in Rom. vi. 10. The contrast implied here is closely similar to that which is expressed in that verse. By *κρεῖττον* (ver. 17) our apostle, as we saw, meant not merely moral superiority considered simply by itself, but superiority from the point of view of advantage to be gained. By *ἅπαξ* we have at the very outset a suggestion of how sublimely this *κρεῖττον* was realized in the case of our Forerunner: He died *once*, to pass thereby to the power of an endless life and to an immeasurable glory.—The prepositions *περί* and *ὑπέρ*, very nearly synonymous in their figurative applications, and often confounded, are employed in this verse with exactness.

Περί simply indicates the gathering of thought, speech, action —favourable, or unfavourable, or indifferent, as the case may be — "around" or "about" a subject, — the sense of "on account of" being in the present place given by the context: *ὑπέρ* suggests a certain favourable interest, a kindly, protecting bending "over." Thus, in speaking of the Saviour's redeeming work, whilst there is some variation, yet naturally and usually *περί* stands connected with "sins," and *ὑπέρ* with "sinners:" cf. Rom. viii. 3, 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10; 1 Pet. ii. 21, John x. 15, xv. 13, Rom. v. 6, 8. On the easy transition of thought, in *ὑπέρ* used of the work of Christ, from the sense of "on behalf of" to that of "in room of," cf. ii. 21, note. In the place before us there appears to be scarcely full naturalness in the antithetical mention of "righteous" and "unrighteous," unless we suppose the thought of substitution to have been actually present to the apostle's mind. On the use of *περί* and *ὑπέρ*, cf. Lightfoot or Ellicott on Gal. i. 4.—There is evidence in N. T. that "the Righteous One" was a well-known designation of the Lord Jesus in the primitive Church; see Acts iii. 14, vii. 52, xxii. 14; 1 John ii. 1; probably also Jas. v. 6. The omission of the article in the present place is obviously intended, by leaving the contrasted terms "righteous" and "unrighteous" in uninterrupted view, to give the supreme marvel (Rom. v. 6–8) its full power; see i. 10, note on *προφῆται*. Of this clause there seems to be a reminiscence and expansion in the *Ep. to Diogn.* § 9, *Αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον Υἱὸν ἀπέδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τὸν ἅγιον ὑπὲρ ἀνόμων, τὸν ἄκακον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν, τὸν δίκαιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδίκων.*

The form in which the purpose of the Saviour's self-sacrifice is here set forth by the apostle, "that He might bring you to God," shows that some such picture of the state of man by nature rose up before him as has been already given in ii. 25. Man was far away from God, under His just sentence of exile, severed from His fellowship, and thus from true goodness and wisdom and happiness, *ἀντὶ πολίτου φυγάς* (Philo, *Mund. Opif.*,

Mang. p. 40). The propitiatory work of Christ was wrought to the intent that, all obstacles being thereby removed, He might through His Spirit lead His wanderers home to God. The verb προσάγειν is not employed elsewhere in N. T. with this spiritual reference, but the cognate substantive προσαγωγή is; cf. Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12. Bengel, pressing the force of the dative τῷ Θεῷ as compared with the more rigidly local πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, finds the joyful readiness of God to receive back His banished ones implied in the case: "Deo id volenti; plus notatur per dativum quam si diceretur *ad Deum*." But this is over-refining, for the dative is the regular construction with this verb in N. T., wherever a remoter object is expressed: cf. Matt. xviii. 24; Acts xvi. 20.

The participles at the close of the verse belong to the clause which is introduced by ἵνα. They clearly go together; and it is obvious that the second of them could not be attached to the main verb ἀπέθανεν as an expansion or circumstantial addition. But in the clause of purpose both participles are perfectly in place. The apostle designs to show in the case of the Saviour—the typical, or, more exactly, the germinant case, as all His people, living in and through Him, know it to be—how suffering for righteousness' sake brings advantage, according to the κρεῖττον of ver. 17. This has been pointed to, as we have seen, by ἅπαξ. In the participial clauses before us it is explicitly set forth, both as to fact and mode,—the Saviour's death in flesh being described as essentially associated with new and glorious life in spirit.

By some excellent interpreters (as Huther, Wiesinger, Alford) ζωοποιηθείς is thought, in accordance with the strict sense of that verb, to refer to our Lord's resurrection. Huther, having defined σάρξ to cover everything in the constitution of man by which he stands related to and has communication with the world, as distinguished from tendencies and faculties having to do with his relation to God (which belong to the πνεῦμα), goes on to give this as his view of Peter's meaning, —that "Christ entered into the state of death, in so far as the

σάρξ pertained to Him, so that His life in the flesh (*sein sarkisches Leben*) ceased; but from death He was brought again to life,—was raised up,—in so far as the πνεῦμα pertained to Him, so that the new life was purely spiritual (*pneumatisch*)." Wiesinger's way of stating the case is that, "as regarded soul and body, Christ ceased to live fleshwise (*sarkisch*), living thenceforward spiritually (*pneumatisch*)." This exegesis is beset with very serious difficulties. *First*, in whatever way we translate the dative πνεύματι—"in, with, according to, spirit," "spiritwise," or in any other way consistent with the force of the case—the meaning of "raised to life with a spiritual body" is not obtained at all naturally, is indeed quite decidedly forced. Supposing the reference of ζωοποιηθείς to be to the resurrection of our Lord, the only meaning which πνεύματι, in the present antithesis, would naturally yield would be that He had a spiritual but in no sense a bodily resurrection. *Secondly*, the supposed meaning, looked at, as it must be, in the light of the antithesis, is contrary to fact. Huther, admitting that πνεῦμα is not = σῶμα πνευματικόν (1 Cor. xv. 44), attempts to justify his position with respect to the sense here, by maintaining that, in the body with which the Lord rose from the grave, He was "no longer ἐν σαρκί, but entirely ἐν πνεύματι." Now, whatever changes there may have been in the constitution of our Lord's body at His rising from the dead, this statement of Huther could not possibly meet with a more direct contradiction than is given by Christ's own words spoken with respect to His resurrection body, πνεῦμα σάρκα . . . οὐκ ἔχει, καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα (Luke xxiv. 39). *Thirdly*, the supposed force of πνεῦμα is not congruous with its use, express or implied, in the rest of the paragraph. Quite evidently, as we have seen, the central thought throughout is of the bearing which suffering in flesh has on life and energy in spirit. Now a reference in our present passage, the starting-point of this course of thought, to our Lord's resurrection, and to His spiritual body, would introduce an element which does not naturally associate itself in any way with the use made of

the antithesis subsequently. Considering these difficulties, we may most safely, with the great majority of expositors, hold that ζωοποιηθείς is not meant by the apostle to describe our Lord's resurrection.

The dative in σαρκί and πνεύματι is that familiar one of the sphere to which a general predicate is limited; and the absence of the article indicates—particularly seeing that there is no preposition—that in the writer's mind the form which the conception took was not specific, "in His flesh," "in His spirit," but had the utmost generality, "in flesh," "in spirit;" cf. iv. 1, 6; Gal. iii. 3. The one sphere is that of what is bodily, outward, material, in which the physical life dwells (cf. ἐν σαρκί, iv. 2); the other is that of the moral nature, of thought, will, affection, —and this here, according to the usual reference of πνεῦμα in N. T., viewed on its directly Godward side. In a place where the contrast is so direct as here, it is obviously quite unnatural to suppose different forces of the dative in the two nouns, and (as A. E. V., deviating in this from the older English versions) to translate "*in* the flesh," "*by* the spirit." It is manifest at the same time, however, from the nature of the case, that the antithesis in the two clauses is not absolutely exact. As regarded "flesh," there was the departure of life; as regarded "spirit," the only possible reference of ζωοποιηθείς, when spoken of the Lord Jesus Christ, is not to a departure of death, to a beginning of life where formerly there had been death, but to an *accession* of power and energy, a "quickening" so great and glorious as naturally to suggest the image of "life from the dead" (Rom. xi. 15). As C. F. Fritzsche expresses it, pointedly, though with a slight alteration as regards the precise form of the thought, "Christ's death was no doubt death for His body, but for His spirit it was birth" (*Nova Opusc. Acad.* p. 287). In every language, words which mean "quicken, enliven," naturally tend towards a somewhat free use, such as this. We see the action of this tendency in N. T. in the case of ζωοποιεῖν (as in 2 Cor. iii. 6; Gal. iii. 21); and the "quickening" of the seed through death (1 Cor. xv. 36, σὺ ὃ σπείρεις

οὐ ζωοποιεῖται, ἐὰν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ) is as exact a parallel in every way to the case before us as could well be conceived.

The course of thought distinctly shows that the "quickening in spirit" resulted from the "being put to death in flesh" (cf. John xii. 24, where, though the word ζωοποιεῖν is not used, the parallelism of thought with the present passage is so close that a reader may reasonably think of the saying of the Lord Jesus there as not improbably in our apostle's mind at this point). But the antithesis does not determine the *time* of the quickening. We may hold it to have followed immediately upon the Lord's death, or to have been coincident with His resurrection. Supposing, however, that it coincided in time with His resurrection, still, as we have seen, the facts designated by "resurrection" and by "quickening," as the word is here used, were distinct.

Vv. 19, 20. The difficulty connected with this famous passage does not to any great extent lie in uncertainty with respect to the meaning of separate words or phrases. As to the exact sense of two or three of these, however, there has been some variety of opinion; and it seems desirable to clear the way for discussion of the main question by dealing first with these.—By a few scholars the antecedent to ἐν ᾧ has been thought to be either the leading statement of the previous verse, ἀπέθανεν, or the immediately preceding participial clause,—the meaning then being "whereby," = διὰ τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν, or διὰ τοῦ πνεύματι ζωοποιηθῆναι,—or possibly even (cf. Heb. vi. 17) "wherefore" (ἀντὶ τοῦ δι ὸ, αἰτιολογικῶς, Œcumen.). The proposed construction is no doubt grammatically possible, and, if an exegesis of the verse otherwise probable required the adoption of it, no decided objection could be made to "whereby;" the somewhat exceptional "wherefore" cannot well be called for here. But the *prima facie* antecedent to ᾧ is not the clause, but simply its last word, the substantive πνεύματι; and the judgement of interpreters generally is that there is no ground for seeking another. Accepting this connection as in all likelihood the true one, ἐν ᾧ means "in

which" as a mode of being, or a sphere of action, the idea of "through which" being also possibly present, but not prominent. The closest parallel to the way in which ἐν is here used is probably ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, 1 Tim. iii. 16.

The words τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν cannot mean anything else than "to the spirits in prison." Such translations of ἐν φυλακῇ as "in a watch-tower," or "in safe keeping," have been proposed by some expositors (as Calvin, Horsley), who hold the apostle's statement to have reference to a preaching of Christ to the spirits of *pious* dead, guarded from all evil, and looking out eagerly for the full blessedness of the resurrection. But renderings like these are devoid of support from N. T. usage.

With regard to the force of ἐκήρυξεν also the usage of N. T. is decisive. Whilst, no doubt, this verb in itself simply means "to make proclamation as a herald" (so in Rev. v. 2), and might therefore readily enough be employed in reference to an announcement of a stern as well as to one of a gracious tenor, yet, in fact, in the language of our Lord and His apostles it is never used of such, but habitually—whether construed with an accusative (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὸν λόγον, or the like), as Gal. ii. 2, 2 Tim. iv. 2; or, as here, without one, as Matt. xi. 1, Mark iii. 14—the verb designates the setting forth of some aspect of God's grace in Christ. The thought, therefore, which has been suggested by some of those interpreters who hold the passage to speak of a visit of Christ to *lost* spirits (as Hollaz, Zezschwitz, Schott), that the word here points to an announcement of *doom*, a *prædicatio* (or *concio*) *damnatoria*, is untenable. Where Christ is said to have "preached," without any specification of what was the subject, the natural conclusion, beyond all doubt, is "that the contents and design of this κήρυγμα were in harmony with the κήρυγμα of Christ elsewhere" (Huther). It may safely be said that, had the apostle intended to speak of an announcement of doom, he could not by possibility have employed a word which, both in his own memory and in that of his readers, had always been associated with mercy. It is obvious also that in a passage

like the present—immediately following a statement of the gracious work and purpose of Christ, and intended, as a reader cannot but think, to illustrate in some way that "quickening in spirit" through which He was to "bring us to God"—the mention of a visit to lost souls to declare their perdition seems far from natural or relevant. The same objections hold to the view maintained by Bengel (which Calvin, whose interpretation of this passage is rather vague, seems also, *Inst.* ii. 16. 9, to some extent to favour), that the "heralding" was twofold, of grace and of doom, according to the spiritual condition before death: "quibusdam (præconium) evangelicum, ad consolationem,—aliis, et fortasse plerisque, legale, ad terrorem."

The translation of the two verses accordingly runs thus: "In which (spirit) also He went and preached to the spirits in prison, disobedient once (or, aforetime) when the long-suffering of God waited patiently in the days of Noah, while an ark was a preparing, in which few (persons), eight souls, namely, were saved through water." What is it that is here referred to? What is meant by "the spirits in prison,"—and when and how did Christ "preach" to them? As one possible view of the reference supports, or seems to support, a certain doctrinal position with regard to the bearing of the work of Christ on the prospects of souls between death and the resurrection, dogmatic prepossessions naturally tend to influence somewhat the judgements of expositors, and no doubt have done so,—probably, from the nature of the subject, on both sides, and with not very unequal force. Some modern commentators give it as their opinion that, however much mystery may attach to the subject on which the apostle touches, yet what it is that he states is amply clear, and that to dogmatic prejudice alone is due the supposition of any difficulty in determining this. Seeing, however, that, as a matter of fact, to innumerable scholars of piety, learning, and sound judgement—many of them not keen dogmatists, but men of a quiet spirit and of much holy candour, such, for example, as Leighton—the exegesis of the verses has seemed very per-

plexing, there is *prima facie* likelihood that the difficulties are not altogether projected into plain words by theological prepossessions, but to some extent lie in the passage itself. The very inability to see that this is so may possibly itself arise, in a measure, from dogmatic prejudice. There seem to be real difficulties, both when one looks carefully at the passage by itself, and when its relation to the context is brought into consideration.

One view of the apostle's reference, which has commended itself to very many expositors, is that he speaks of something which was done by the Saviour after His death, in the region of separate souls. Eliminating as untenable, on grounds already mentioned, those forms of this exegesis in which our Lord's mission is supposed to have been to pious souls, or, being to souls of wicked men, to have been for the denunciation of doom,—we have left for consideration, as the supposed meaning of Peter's statement, that the Lord Jesus after His death—either while still disembodied (so most of those who maintain this interpretation), or after assuming His new body (so Huther, Wiesinger, and some others)—visited the region of lost souls, and there made proclamation of His work of grace to the spirits of that wicked generation who perished in the Deluge. The sense here attached to the expression "spirits in prison," as equivalent to "souls of bad men in their place of punishment," is beyond doubt the natural one; and φυλακή with a closely kindred application is found in Rev. xx. 7; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6. Wright (*Bibl. Essays*, p. 167) well cites also, as to some extent illustrative, Isa. xxiv. 21, 22, where the words in LXX. are δεσμωτήριον and ὀχύρωμα. Peter's φυλακή here corresponds exactly to Justin Martyr's χῶρος χείρων, in τὰς μὲν τῶν εὐσεβῶν (ψυχὰς) ἐν κρείττονί που χώρῳ μένειν, τὰς δὲ ἀδίκους καὶ πονηρὰς ἐν χείρονι, τὸν τῆς κρίσεως ἐκδεχομένας χρόνον (*Tryph.* 5).

It is quite clear that, in considering the meaning of the passage, we cannot deal with it as if it contained an isolated anecdote, but must have regard to its relations to the con-

text. It occurs in the course of a paragraph of counsel and encouragement to persecuted believers. The example of the Lord Jesus has been adduced; and the words now before us are closely connected, as ἐν ᾧ indicates, with the last statement of the previous verse, that, "having been put to death in flesh, Christ was quickened in spirit,"—a statement which, as examination of the modes of expression in iv. 1, 6, has already shown us, had great prominence at the time in the apostle's thoughts, and indeed determined to a certain extent the whole line of his observations throughout the paragraph. We naturally conclude, then, that the present relative sentence was meant to illustrate this statement in some way; and, on that view of the reference which has just been given, we must suppose that our Lord's "preaching to the spirits in prison" is mentioned as affording a most striking proof of His having been "quickened in spirit." Both in the sentence taken by itself, and when it is thus viewed in its relation to the context, very grave difficulties in the way of this exegesis present themselves.

In the first place, it will be observed that the participle ἀπειθήσασιν has no article,—a fact which, attached in construction as the word is to a substantive which *has* the article, intimates, according to one of the least variable of all the rules of Greek syntax, that the participle is employed, not attributively, but as a part of the predicate, being intended to explain or illustrate the statement contained in the verb to which the participle is subordinate, by adding some information with regard to time, cause, manner, or the like. If such a participial clause be rendered in English by a relative pronoun (as here in both A. and R. V.,—cf. 2 Tim. i. 10), it has to be borne in mind, for exactness of thought, that the relative is appended somewhat loosely, and conveys really such a force as would be given by "when," "seeing that," "although," "if," or some other conjunction. Now, what is the logical force of the participle in the place before us, supposing the reference in the main verb ἐκήρυξεν to be to a

"preaching" by the Saviour after His death in the region of lost souls? Mere precedence in time of the disobedience ("after they had been disobedient") cannot be thought of as relevant, millenniums having intervened; neither can the causal use ("because they had been disobedient") well be deemed possible; and manner and hypothesis are out of the question. No other force of the participle than the concessive, "although," seems to present itself as even possibly suitable; and this can hardly be judged very natural. Seeing that in the incarnation, and at every stage of His work and His sufferings, our Lord "commended His love toward us" supremely through this, that "although" we were sinners, hard-hearted and disobedient, still He dealt with us in grace, it does not seem likely that the apostle—purposing to illustrate the glorious increase of spiritual power which followed His sufferings and death—would, speaking of His "preaching" to certain lost souls, add "*although* they were aforetime disobedient." Such a clause hardly has the strength and point characteristic of Scripture expression. Had such been the thought, moreover, this would obviously, in the connection, have very special stress laid upon it, and καίπερ, one may naturally think, would probably have been prefixed,—cf. *e.g.* 2 Pet. i. 12; Heb. v. 8, vii. 5, xii. 17. On this last point, however, while from the structure of the sentence some weight may be laid, yet we cannot fairly lay much, when we compare *e.g.* 1 Tim. i. 7, 13.—This point in the grammar of the passage, one plainly by no means unimportant in its bearing on the exegesis, is to a somewhat singular extent overlooked or slurred over by commentators,—perhaps because the frequent translation by a relative pronoun tends to hide the precise state of the case. Wiesinger, with his characteristic carefulness and candour, has had regard to the anarthrous construction, and has translated, in accordance with rule, by "after they had been disobedient," subsequently explaining this to mean, in the connection, "although they had been disobedient." But many, most perhaps, of those who support

that view of the reference of the passage which is now under discussion, seem silently to disregard the want of the article, translating and commenting as if it were present. De Wette, for example, rendering "who aforetime were disobedient," has, as his sole note on this,—"A further description of these spirits through specification of their guilt." Huther does touch on the grammatical question, and expressly maintains that the absence of the article makes no difference in the meaning. He criticises Wiesinger's rendering "although," observing—with some reason, as has been already seen—that "an adversative relation of this kind would have needed to be more plainly expressed;" and, as his own position, he asserts that "the participle attached in an adjectival way to a substantive is often enough joined to it without an article." No instance, however, is cited. The remark is either wholly irrelevant, having reference to the case of an anarthrous participle connected with a substantive which is itself anarthrous, or it is curiously divergent from commonly received grammatical doctrine. Sheldon Green, whose discussion of the use of the article in his *Gram. of N. T.* is among the fullest and the most philosophical and satisfactory to be found anywhere, expressly (p. 54) adduces the present passage as one of his examples of proof given by anarthrousness that a participle is not employed for the purpose of more full definition, but is closely associated with the main verb, and has a force which may be paraphrased by a conjunction.

Secondly, on that view of the reference of the passage which is now before us, the proportions, and the relations to each other, of the two parts of the sentence are hard to explain, — whatever be regarded as the precise form of thought lying in the connection of the participle with the main verb, whether "although" or some other. The subordinate clause beginning with ἀπειθήσασιν is three times as long as the principal one,—a fact certainly fitted to suggest that much of the force of the apostle's illustration or proof of our Lord's being "quickened in spirit" is to be found in that

clause; yet in truth, on the present exegesis, not merely has the clause no particular force, but of some of it even the relevancy is, to say the least, not obvious. The mention of "the patient waiting of the divine long-suffering in the days of Noah," and the reference to the "few" who were saved, —a fact seemingly judged by Peter of such weight in his course of thought that he adds the precise number,—would have been entirely pertinent by way of contrast, had it been stated in the main clause that the Lord's brief preaching after His death had been *effectual*, having turned a multitude of the wicked spirits, or all of them, to repentance; but on this head not the slightest hint is given. No doubt, supposing "although" to represent the link of thought, a certain relevancy may be discerned in the earlier statement of the participial clause,—as bringing out impressively the guilt of the antediluvian sinners, by describing the long-suffering which they spurned. The latter part, however, regarding the small number of the saved, does not seem to fit in naturally. With "although" as the introductory word, this part of the sentence must be supposed to point out the all but universality of impenitence in that generation. Now, the stress of the whole statement really resting on this, it seems very unlikely that the apostle would have left it to come before the mind simply by inference,—what he *expresses* being that divine mercy was shown to the penitent few.

Thirdly, the fact adverted to above, that nothing more is said with regard to our Lord's supposed work among the lost spirits than that He "*preached*" to certain of them, constitutes in itself a difficulty in the way of accepting the view under consideration. The death of Christ brought life to men. His "quickening in spirit" has been proved by the joy and holiness of a multitude which no man can number. This we know. Now, natural as it might seem to speak of these triumphs which have been achieved by the "quickened" Christ in this world, we may no doubt suppose it to have

nevertheless been Peter's intention, on some ground, in giving a proof of the Lord's power in spirit, to speak of action by Him in the regions of the dead rather than among men on earth. But the simple announcement that Christ "*preached*" in Hades to the spirits of a certain class of wicked men, seems to lack that great and manifest weight as evidence which in the connection is naturally looked for.

Fourthly, it is difficult, looking at the apostle's manner of expression, to think anything else than that he believed himself to be in this passage saying something as far as possible from obscure, something which, as regarded its meaning and its bearings, every reader would at once understand and recognise as fully pertinent to the course of thought. At no point does his tone suggest, "Behold, I show you a mystery." In particular, the way in which in the subordinate clause he dwells on the conduct and fate of the antediluvians while on earth, gives a reader irresistibly the impression—assuming the interpretation under discussion to be true—that in the writer's mind his statement that in the regions of the lost the Saviour preached to the spirits of *these* men, had a special and obvious relevancy to his line of remark, and a distinct and manifest bearing on the circumstances of those whom he addresses. Now, in point of fact, special relevancy of any kind in a reference to the position or history of the antediluvian unbelievers, as analogous to or having any peculiar bearing whatever on that of the Asiatic Christians, is so far from being obvious, that of all the attempts which have been made by scholars holding the exegesis under consideration to exhibit such, no one makes even a slight approach to reasonable likelihood. At every point the position of the apostle's readers stood in direct contrast to that of the antediluvian sinners. Instead of being impenitent, living obstinate under the divine long-suffering during many years of outward prosperity, those to whom this letter was written were servants of God, sorely tried by persecution for their faithfulness to Him; and the present passage is a prominent part of a paragraph of

encouragement to hope, and to patient cleaving to Christ and His service, notwithstanding persecution. Not merely, therefore, does nothing specially suited to their case in the detailed mention of the antediluvians present itself, but the absence of parallelism is somewhat marked. And the thought of the application of a *contrast*, or of a parallel with the position of the *adversaries* of the Asiatic believers, does not seem to have the slightest naturalness, or at all to suit the details of the passage. It may be said that perhaps teaching given orally to these Churches by Peter or—to his knowledge—by some other evangelist, may have made them familiar with the Lord's preaching in Hades to the spirits of the antediluvians, and trained them to see certain subtle analogies between the case of these ancient rebels against God and their own, or bearings of it of some kind on their circumstances such as might make a reference to it specially helpful. Nothing at all, however, can be said in support of this supposition, except that, if it were true, the particular form of exegesis now before us would be somewhat simplified thereby. It has no historical support, and, while of course not impossible, seems to be in a very high degree unlikely. That a statement of so remarkable a kind should be made over the Pauline region of Asia Minor, so early, widely, and fully, as would be implied in the apprehension of Peter's supposed statement here as something thoroughly familiar by the members of all the Churches throughout all the provinces named in the beginning of the Epistle,—and yet that not the slightest allusion to this teaching should be found in any of the Apostle Paul's letters, nor any tradition of it in later literature,—is exceedingly improbable. Accordingly we have every reason to think that, if the interpretation of the apostle's language which we have now before us be the true one, then in a passage, the structure and connection of which appear distinctly to imply the writer's belief that its statements were familiar, and their argumentative force and special pertinence obvious, to those for whom he wrote, the main statement—one of a very remarkable nature

—was in fact startlingly new to them, and the logical bearing of the whole obscure in the extreme.

These difficulties in the way of accepting this exegesis seem to be very grave. By many of those who accede to it, a great deal has been read into the passage. It has been supposed that the apostle's words may legitimately be taken as intended to suggest that Christ's preaching to the spirits of the antediluvians carried with it saving power; and also that these spirits represent the whole class of human souls which have passed out from this earthly life impenitent. Supposing the thought thus amplified, while some of those objections to the interpretation which have been mentioned would remain in their full strength, the relation of the main statement to the apostle's line of thought in the context would be simplified. The Lord's "quickening in spirit" would be impressively illustrated. But all this reading in of teaching additional to what the apostle expresses is purely arbitrary. There is not a word in the passage, or in the context, to hint either that the antediluvians are spoken of as representing any wider class, or that the "preaching" of the Lord was effectual. The very fact, indeed, that by adding certain ideas we satisfy in some measure the requirements of the context, while, as the words stand, there seems to be but very imperfect accordance with these requirements, goes to show it to be unlikely that we may justly add these ideas. The apostle's own impulse, yearning as he was to comfort and stimulate his brethren, must have been to state his case as strongly as, consistently with what he knew to be true, he was able to do,—or at least up to the point where no sense of disappointment with respect to the aptness and force of the illustration or evidence which he brings forward could reasonably be felt. His stopping where he has done, therefore, seems to show that he could not go farther,—or else that what he has said was meant by him with a different reference from that which this exegesis gives it.

A few interpreters indeed—including, singularly enough

the generally so judicious Bengel—have endeavoured to make out that the assumption of a wider reference than to the spirits of the antediluvian unbelievers is not arbitrary,—this reference lying in the statements of the passage itself. They take *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν* to mean *all* the lost spirits, and assume that then the apostle goes on—with an understood "particularly," or "for example"—to speak in some detail of a certain class, a species under the afore-mentioned genus. This is a refuge of desperation. Nothing can be more certain than that, according to the principles of Greek writing, *ἀπειθήσασιν* does not answer to *τοῖς πνεύμασιν* as the second member of a parallelism to the first (which is obviously the kind of structure supposed), but that it is in the strictest sense in agreement with it, and precisely co-extensive. Reuss (*Christ. Theol.*, E. T. vol. ii. p. 274) says candidly, "The difficulty, that Peter seems to restrict the 'preaching' to the contemporaries of Noah, is insoluble,—unless we are prepared to say that the author, in commencing the phrase in ver. 20, was so preoccupied with the typological comparison he meant to institute between the Flood and baptism, that he thus forgot to insert some word which would have shown that the antecedent phrase had a universal application to the unbelievers of former days, and that the victims of the Deluge were introduced only as a particular example." If supplementary dealing with Scripture in the way here suggested by Reuss were recognised as legitimate, the boundaries of Christian doctrine might be extended very rapidly.

According to another view of the apostle's meaning in this passage, which has been held by some excellent expositors (as Schöttgen, Grotius, Leighton ultimately, Bp. Burnet, and Professor John Brown), he speaks of the proof of the Lord's having been mightily "quickened in spirit" which was given by the marvellous and widely diffused saving efficiency of His "preaching" through the apostles from Pentecost onwards. The human race in its universality and continuity is supposed to be spoken of. The expression,

"the spirits in prison," designates living men, who are by nature in a prison-house, in bondage to sin and Satan (cf. Isa. xlii. 7, ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐξ οἴκου φυλακῆς, Sept.; xlix. 9, lxi. 1). The reference to the condition of mankind in the time before the Deluge (the same *race* as those to whom the apostles preached, "iidem non ἀριθμῷ, ut Aristoteles loquitur, sed genere," Grotius) is made, and this in a somewhat detailed way, "to show the greater efficacy of Christ's preaching than of Noah's, though he was a signal preacher of righteousness" (Leighton). This is ingenious and attractive. It accords well with the course of thought in the context, and accounts to some extent for the structure of ver. 20. The ascription of the apostolic preaching directly to the Lord, in whom it was carried on and from whom came its power, has an exact parallel in Eph. ii. 17, and a close analogy in Acts xxvi. 23. Any objection connecting itself with ἐν ᾧ, too, might be overcome by adopting the construction—already recognised as possible, though not probable—which takes as antecedent to the relative, not πνεύματι alone, but the clause ζωοποιηθεὶς πνεύματι.

But there are serious and indeed insuperable difficulties in the way of accepting this interpretation. The use, in a passage like the present, of τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν in the highly poetical sense here assumed seems to be exceedingly unlikely, there being nothing whatever in the context to direct the mind to such a meaning. It is true that the word κηρύσσειν occurs in the LXX. rendering of Isa. lxi. 1, Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἀπέσταλκέ με κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν. This verb, however, is one in very common use, and no indication can reasonably be recognised in ἐκήρυξεν of our passage that that verse of Isaiah was in Peter's mind. But the fatal objection to the exegesis lies in its making the principal clause and the subordinate apply to different sets of persons. The nature of the passage is not such as at all to admit this variety of reference. The following sentence has been given as one analogous in structure to the apostle's, —"God sent the gospel to the Britons, who in the days of

Cæsar were painted savages." This is a natural and intelligible sentence; and the persons spoken of in the relative clause, whilst of the same race with those spoken of in the main clause, were a different generation. Thus far there is an analogy with what this exegesis takes the apostle's words to mean. But it is obvious that, in the sentence quoted, the words of the relative clause would be altogether irrelevant and unnatural, if at the time when God sent the gospel, and subsequently, the Britons had *continued* to be painted savages. Difference of circumstances is essential to the subordinate clause's having any pertinence. Now in our passage the *absence* of difference of circumstances, with regard to what, in the connection, is evidently the principal point, namely, spiritual condition, stands out prominently on the face of the sentence,—seeing that, according to the exegesis, those to whom our Lord preached through the apostles are expressly declared to have been "in the prison-house of sin." To a main clause which says this, the statement with respect to the men of the former generation, "disobedient aforetime," does not attach itself with the least naturalness.

The two forms of exegesis which have been discussed make the "preaching" spoken of to have taken place after the occurrences mentioned in the 18th verse. These interpretations take for their chief guide regarding the reference of the passage the 19th verse, as containing the principal clause of the relative sentence, and that which first meets a reader. According to it, the *prima facie* likelihood undoubtedly is that the events are set before us in the order of time in which they occurred, *ἀπέθανεν* (which *θανατωθείς* echoes), *ζωοποιηθεὶς πνεύματι, πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν.*

A third exegesis remains to be considered, which—finding it difficult to reconcile the first clause, when looked on as mentioning an occurrence in sequence of time, with the latter part of the sentence—begins with the consideration of this latter part, and gathers from it that the reference in *ἐν ᾧ πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν* is an incidental one to a gracious work

of Christ long prior to the events touched on in ver. 18. In this case ἐκήρυξεν is conveniently, for distinctness, translated by a pluperfect,—the precise grammatical view of the case, however, being not that the aorist is here used with the force of a pluperfect, but that the writer prefers to make his statement in a simple narrative way by itself, without formally indicating the priority of the one past event to the other. In such a case, indeed, as Alex. Buttmann remarks (*Gram.* p. 200), an author seems for the moment to transfer himself as a narrator to the time of the past event last mentioned, and then, quite naturally, to speak also of the event prior to it by a tense of the simple past. This use of the narrative preterite occurs occasionally, no doubt, in all languages: in English, particularly in conversational style, it is frequent. In classical Greek the aorist employed in this way is not uncommon in subordinate clauses; and in the Hellenistic writers, influenced by the Hebrew mode of expression, it is found in such clauses very frequently. With relative pronouns and adverbs it occurs many times in N. T.: cf. *e.g.* Matt. xxvii. 55; Luke vi. 18, xix. 37; John xii. 1. In the parallels, Matt. xxvii. 60, Mark xv. 46, the aorist occurs in the one and the pluperfect in the other. In the passage now before us the relative clause makes approach, from the obvious weightiness of its statement, whatever precisely is the reference, to the position of a principal rather than a subordinate one. The relative pronoun is used with something of that continuative force which our apostle favours (cf. ver. 21, i. 6, 8, 10),—not, however, in the present instance, to the extent of making this a separate sentence, but merely one requiring to be marked off from what precedes by a semicolon rather than a comma. In a statement of so much independent weight, the use of the aorist where the time is pluperfect is not at all so common as in subordinate clauses strictly so called. It does occur occasionally, however; cf. particularly the well-defined main statement in Matt. xiv. 3. Looking at N. T. usage with regard to this

point, as a whole, there can be no reasonable doubt that, supposing it to have been the apostle's purpose to refer in this relative clause to an event prior to those mentioned in the preceding verse, he might readily enough use the aorist; and if, in speaking of such an event, it was in his mind to employ the word *κηρύσσειν*, there was a very great likelihood that he would avail himself of this tense, because the perfect and pluperfect active of this verb appear to have been but little used, probably because the forms were felt to be somewhat cumbrous and hardly euphonious. For the uncompounded verb *κηρύσσειν*, indeed, no instance at all of either the perfect or the pluperfect is cited by Veitch (*Irreg. Gr. Verbs, s.v.*). The supposition that in the present place a pluperfect force belongs to *ἐκήρυξεν*, is not confined to advocates of the exegesis now under consideration. Thus Alford, who strenuously maintains the reference to be to a work done by our Lord after His death, holds that *ζωοποιηθείς* speaks of His resurrection, but that the "preaching" took place between death and resurrection, "because *ἐν ᾧ καὶ κτλ.* might very well be a taking up again of *πνεύματι*, recapitulating some former act also done in the spirit."

According to the exegesis now before us, the apostle's statement is,—"in which also He went" (with the force of "had gone") "and preached to the spirits in prison, when disobedient aforetime," etc. The reference is in this case, of course, to a gracious work done by our Lord in His divine nature before His incarnation. In looking at the likelihood of this mode of interpretation, we are apt, at first sight, to have a sense of difficulty in passing from the antecedent *πνεύματι*, as it stands connected with *ζωοποιηθείς*, to the relative *ᾧ*,—difficulty, however, which on a moment's consideration we see to be possibly, and on further consideration may see to be probably, due to our attaching to *πνεύματι* a limitation of reference which was not in the writer's mind. What has been said in the close of the previous verse is that, "having been put to death in flesh" (and manifestly, according

to the course of thought, *through* being put to death in flesh), "Christ was quickened"—introduced into new and glorious energy—"in spirit." The manifestation given of the divine righteousness through the Lord's propitiatory sufferings and death made it a possible thing for Him, consistently with the majesty of God's government, to bless men with life everlasting (Rom. iii. 25, 26). His entering into this sphere of full life-giving gracious activity was His being "quickened in spirit." Now, as was formerly observed, the words σαρκί and πνεύματι have plainly, from their anarthrousness—and this particularly seeing that they are used without a preposition — the greatest generality of reference possible in the connection in which they stand. They designate constituents of the Person of our Lord,—but this specially as spheres of certain distinct kinds of experience and action, of which the writer is mainly thinking. Not merely when one carefully considers the line of thought in this passage itself, but still more decidedly when we examine the use of σαρκί in iv. 1, and of σαρκί and πνεύματι in iv. 6,—a use quite indisputably resting on the way in which the terms are employed here,—it is plain that this idea of spheres of experience stands foremost in the writer's mind. We seem to have no reason to suppose that, when the apostle wrote πνεύματι, he was thinking in a definite specific way of the Saviour's human "spirit" (Luke xxiii. 46), or of its distinctions from and relations to His divine nature,—distinctions and relations which, beyond question, were to Peter, as they are to us, a profound mystery. What the apostle had before his mind, apparently, was simply the sphere in which (primarily and radically) saving energy acts; and this is the moral nature, πνεῦμα, which is the organ of communication between man and God,—for, as "God is a spirit," so, through His blessed will, "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." Thus πνεῦμα is the sphere or form of existence in which the application of redemption takes place. Σάρξ, taken by itself, can influence only that which is material;

πνεῦμα alone can exert that power on moral natures by which σωτηρία ψυχῶν (i. 9) is to be effected. Now, whilst of *death* the human nature alone of our Lord was susceptible, the unity of His Person at the same time giving infinite dignity and value to the sacrifice, the Christian heart, in praising Him as "the *Life*," looks directly both to His Godhead and His Manhood. The εἶναι of eternal existence and the γίγνεσθαι of beginning to be have both place here: ἐν Αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν (John i. 4) and (ἐγένετο) ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (1 Cor. xv. 45). Thus, having spoken of πνεῦμα in the most general way as the sphere in which the Lord was "quickened," the apostle may naturally attach to this πνεῦμα a relative clause mentioning a work of grace done by Him in His pre-incarnate mode of being,—which was πνεῦμα. It is to be noted, indeed, that in the only two places in N. T. besides the present in which the σάρξ and the πνεῦμα of the Lord Jesus are placed in express antithesis (Rom. i. 3 ; 1 Tim. iii. 16), πνεῦμα means, according to the most probable exegesis, His divine mode of being,—which may possibly be the reference of the word in Heb. ix. 14 also. It does not seem natural in our passage to take the antithesis in the end of ver. 18 quite in the same way as in the places just referred to. Yet these passages certainly show that there is nothing in the least alien from what may reasonably be supposed to have been an apostle's mode of thought or expression, in regarding Peter as from πνεύματι—used in its most general form, and with the thought of "the sphere in which grace works" prominently attached to it—passing on, in a relative clause connected with it, to speak of a work of grace done by our Lord in His divine nature. And in such a rapid transition from mention of experiences of the incarnate Lord to mention of acts performed by Him in His pre-incarnate state, there is nothing inconsistent with the usage of Scripture. Frequently, through full view of the oneness of the Person of the Son of God, the economical modification of that Person by the assumption of human

nature is not specially regarded. The historic Christ Himself, in the midst of His controversies with captious men when in the world, said, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 58). He told His disciples, "I came out from the Father and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go unto the Father" (John xvi. 28). In His high-priestly prayer on the night before He was crucified, one of His petitions was, "O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was" (John xvii. 5).

As has been already said, it is not improbable that to many students this supposed generality in the use of *πνεύματι*, through which *ἐν ᾧ*, attached to it, can introduce a clause speaking of our Lord's work in His pre-incarnate state, may seem somewhat forced and unlikely. It did for a time to the present writer. But the more fully the anarthrous forms *σαρκί* and *πνεύματι* are looked at, the more distinctly does it appear that no reference except a very general one is consistent with grammar, and that our having a difficulty in accepting this reference is due to our coming to the examination of the passage with a preconceived notion that the apostle could not but express himself with the precision which systematic theology aims at. If a student sees his way clear to regarding this reference of *πνεύματι ἐν ᾧ* as legitimate, there appears to be nothing else in the language of the verses which should made him hesitate to recognise the exegesis under discussion as possibly the true one,—its likelihood, of course, remaining to be tried by its fitness to explain the whole structure of the passage, and its suitableness to the context. There are, however, several points with respect to the language which claim a few remarks.

That circumstantiality which in some measure belongs to all fresh simple narration, and which is in particular a marked feature of Oriental narrative, shows itself in the Greek Scriptures in, among other things, the frequent prefixing of such participles as *ἐλθών*, *ἀναστάς*, *πορευθείς*, to a verb of action.

Whilst generally designating actual bodily movement, these words seem occasionally to serve simply to express in a graphic way the starting to exertion, it may be mental or moral; cf. Matt. ix. 13. Naturally, in accordance with that anthropomorphic representation which God has so graciously, and with such abundance and variety, employed in His revelation, in order that a vivid impression of His character and working may be made on men, His manifestations of power, whether of an outward kind or over men's hearts, are often described by words of local motion (in LXX. *ἔρχεσθαι, πορεύεσθαι, ἥκειν* κτλ.). The use with reference to God of the participle prefixed is exceptional; see, however, Gen. xi. 7, *καταβάντες συγχέωμεν αὐτῶν ἐκεῖ τὴν γλῶσσαν.* In N. T. also the same mode of representing the divine procedure by verbs of motion is found (*e.g.* John xiv. 23). The words in Eph. ii. 17, in particular, regarding the spiritual action of the glorified Saviour through His apostles and other preachers, *ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην*, form a very close parallel to *πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν* in the passage before us, as these words are taken in the exegesis now under discussion, —and this as regards both the use of the participle of the verb of motion, and the application of *ἐκήρυξεν* to teaching of the divine Logos through intermediate agencies. The *πορευθείς* which occurs in ver. 22 has by some expositors been thought to stand in a certain correspondence with the participle as occurring here (ver. 19), and to show that the present is one of a series of statements in sequence of time,— the Lord's death, going to preach in Hades, resurrection, ascension. But there seems to be no real force in this. The verb *πορεύεσθαι* is an exceedingly common one; it is used somewhat differently in the two places,—here, in that subordinate way, introductory to the main verb, which was spoken of above,—there, with its full force, *εἰς οὐρανόν* being expressly added; and there is no indication of any kind that in the apostle's mind the participle in ver. 19 and that in ver. 22 were thought of as being in correlation. Viewed as

connected with a "preaching" in the days of Noah, πορευθείς before ἐκήρυξεν has a very natural and beautiful force, intensifying that expression of earnestness and persistence in the work of grace which is so marked in ver. 20, and the object of which—supposing this the true exegesis—will be spoken of afterwards. Πορευθείς sets forth the eager movement of love, similarly, in so far,—though, of course, with obvious differences,—to the "running" of the Father to meet His returning prodigal, or to the "standing" of Jesus on the right hand of God, as risen ready to welcome His persecuted servant Stephen.

According to the exegesis at present before us, the time pointed to in the participle ἀπειθήσασιν is not prior to, but coincident with, that of ἐκήρυξεν. To our accepting here this very familiar N. T. time of an aorist participle joined to a main verb in the aorist, Wiesinger objects on the ground that, as the disobedience was long continued, the participle of the imperfect, ἀπειθοῦσιν, would have been the natural form; and refers to iii. 6, v. 12, as showing Peter's practice to be confirmatory of this. But the "preaching" also was of long continuance, and if the apostle gathers this up, and by the aorist presents it as one historic fact (cf. ii. 22), its concomitant, the disobedience, is quite naturally exhibited in the same form. It is to be remembered also that, with relation to ἐκήρυξεν, antecedence to a certain extent, causality indeed, is to be recognised in ἀπειθήσασιν, as well as concomitance: cf. Acts xiv. 2; Heb. iii. 18, xi. 31, all of them cases of this particular aorist participle, ἀπειθήσας, used with a main verb in the aorist, and all with a force very similar to that found here on the view under discussion. Wiesinger's references, given above, are not relevant, because in the former of the two passages aorist participles could not have been used without materially altering the meaning (see notes *in loc.*), and in the other the aorist is one of *form* merely, to which only present participles could naturally attach themselves.

The particle ποτέ belongs without doubt immediately to

ἀπειθήσασιν,—not, as has been maintained by Hofmann, to ἐκήρυξεν. Its position connects it with the participle, and quite decidedly its correlation with ὅτε, because—the clause introduced by ὅτε plainly going with ποτέ—ἀπειθήσασιν would, unless ποτέ belongs to it, stand unnaturally isolated. The fact that this particle is joined to ἀπειθήσασιν appears at first sight to favour somewhat strongly the view that the main clause and the participial refer to different times,—that the "disobedience" spoken of was long prior to the "preaching." "Si sermo esset de præconio per Noe, τὸ 'aliquando' aut plane omitteretur, aut cum 'prædicavit' conjungeretur" (Bengel). On consideration, however, it will be seen that there is not really much weight in this argument. There would have been, if the Epistle had been a document written in a leisurely way, and with minute attention to literary form. But the just comparison of the style of the epistolary writings of N. T., and in a measure indeed of the style of N. T. generally, is with that of our own familiar letters or of conversation. Now,—applying this comparison, and supposing the reference in "preached" and "disobedient" to be to the same time,—how should we express the sentence, if it were our own, occurring in friendly discussion or in a private letter? If we were speaking or writing with deliberation, and had the thought in all its amplification distinctly before us when we began the sentence, we should naturally say, "in which He went (had gone) long before, and preached to those who are now spirits in prison, when disobedient at the time when," etc. But there would be nothing in the least degree unnatural—supposing our speaking or writing rapidly, and taking up the thought at a slightly different angle—in our saying, as Peter does, "in which He went (had gone) and preached to the spirits in prison,—when disobedient long before, at the time when," etc. We have all myriads of times constructed sentences somewhat in this way. The immediate connection of ποτέ, therefore, proves nothing with respect to the chief question in

the exegesis. It will be seen also that, if the thought presented itself to the apostle in the shape just supposed,—that is, without his having, at the moment when he began the sentence, the form in which he would expand it distinctly before his mind,—then the expression of a *νῦν* (*τοῖς νῦν ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν*) to mark off in a formal way the time of the "preaching" (and of the active disobedience in the world) from that of the "imprisonment," would not have been altogether natural. There stood out in view before him simply the gracious pleading of the divine Logos with certain persons, and the failure of that pleading to convert,—a failure evinced by the fact that, as these persons came before his mind, they were *τὰ ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύματα*. The difference of time between the pleading and the proof of persistence in obduracy which was afforded by the imprisonment, was a matter of course, and, with the illustration arising before him in the form supposed, could not naturally present itself as a distinct thought finding expression in a *νῦν*.

Dean Alford says that "it must be evident to every unprejudiced scholar how alien such an interpretation"—that now before us—"is from the plain meaning and connection of the words and clauses." Allowing for the strength of expression somewhat characteristic of Alford's style, and judging from the detailed remarks which follow, these words mean, in substance, pretty nearly what Huther says in a more measured way,—"Had Peter closed his sentence with *ἐκήρυξεν*, it could have occurred to no one that he was here speaking of a preaching of Christ which took place at a time long gone by." This statement of Huther is true,—but has really no argumentative force. The general fact that an immense proportion of the sentences of every writer and speaker have the main clause in such a form that, unless the light which later clauses throw on details and modifications be waited for, a hearer or reader would largely—often entirely—misconceive the meaning, is so patent that, no doubt, Huther's reference is to specialties found in the present case. Now, as regards the

whole structure of the passage, the same may safely be said which was put forward a moment ago respecting the position of *ποτέ* in particular, that any sense of difficulty which arises in the way of accepting the exegesis under consideration as legitimate springs from applying canons of literary exactness which are not justly applicable,—the style of N. T., especially of the Epistles, having everywhere the freedom of animated conversation or of the letters of intimate friends. In talk or writing of this kind there occur continually sentences in all respects such as the present is, on the supposition that preaching of Christ to the antediluvians while they lived in this world is spoken of. A friend who has been travelling tells us, "I visited the town of A., then went on to B., and ultimately came to C.,—where I pleaded with the unhappy young men in prison, when I saw them years ago taking the first steps on the road which has led them to ruin." Let this sentence stop with the word "prison," and, undoubtedly, after the previous preterites, "pleaded" would naturally be taken as in narrative sequence. But, when the words which follow are reached, the mind has no sense of anything in the least unnatural in accepting the reference as a retrospective one,—which in speaking is marked by the tone, and in writing, it may be, by the punctuation. This sentence, it will be observed, answers to Peter's with respect to several points in which his may be thought to deviate from rigid precision of construction,—the use of the aorist with a pluperfect reference,—the absence of *νῦν* from *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν*,—and the insertion of *ποτέ* in the subordinate instead of in the chief clause. Examined by the true standard, that of conversational style, there is nothing in any of these points, or in the combination of them, in the smallest degree unnatural. As regards the use of the simple preterite "pleaded," for "had pleaded," another remark may be made. One feels that the fact which is implied in the article, "*the* unhappy young men," and indeed in the whole tone of the reference to them,—that the person addressed has

already some knowledge respecting them and respecting the "pleadings" alluded to,—makes the employment of the simple preterite, as the more direct and less formal tense, somewhat specially natural; and this answers precisely to the effect of τοῖς in τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν.

On the whole, therefore, there appears to be nothing in the language of the passage to prevent our reckoning the exegesis now under consideration as possibly the true one,—nothing which, when the free, inartificial style of N. T. is kept in mind, could reasonably be judged strained in the mode of expression, supposing that the apostle meant here to speak of Christ's preaching in His pre-incarnate state to the ante-diluvians while living in this world.

If such really be the reference, ἐκήρυξεν would seem to be naturally taken with a wide application. Every mode in which the Personal Word of God pleaded with men is included. The ordinary influences of His providence, and the special appeal which the building of the ark—with its, no doubt, well-known purpose—made to that generation, were forms of the "preaching." But whilst these may quite reasonably be included, it appears to be purely arbitrary, and altogether unsatisfactory, to exclude from the reference (with some recent advocates of this exegesis, as Schweizer, Salmond, Wright) the personal teaching and exhortation of Noah. In the remarkable statement made by Peter in i. 11, the word πνεῦμα is, no doubt, not employed as in our present passage, but designates the Holy Ghost; still very striking and interesting testimony is obviously at the same time given by his language there as to the vividness with which the thought of the pre-incarnate Christ as the teacher of the O. T. sages, through the mission of His Spirit, stood out before Peter's mind. To our apostle, therefore, evidently, it would be a natural form of thought that in Noah's preaching it was Christ who preached; and—assuming the interpretation now before us to be the true one—the use of the particular word ἐκήρυξεν appears to suggest the presence in Peter's mind of

precisely this thought,—seeing that in 2 Ep. ii. 5 Noah is expressly called δικαιοσύνης κῆρυξ. Exactly in the same way, in a passage which has been already referred to (Eph. ii. 17), we are told that the glorified Saviour "came and preached (εὐηγγελίσατο) peace" to the Ephesians,—inasmuch as with the indwelling of His Spirit Paul and other evangelists did this. The fact that Noah "preached" is not mentioned in the O. T., but had been preserved by tradition, and was very familiar. Of this familiarity, and that the particular word κηρύσσειν was that employed with regard to him, there is ample evidence besides that which is afforded by the expression in 2 Peter; cf. Clem. Rom. § 7, Νῶε ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν, καὶ οἱ ὑπακούσαντες ἐσώθησαν, and the references to a number of similar statements in the earliest writers, which are given by Bishop Lightfoot, in a note there in his edition. The fact that Noah himself was one of those "eight" mentioned in the latter part of ver. 20, who, believing the divine warnings, availed themselves of the ark, has been urged as an objection to the view that his personal preaching is here referred to. But this has no force whatever. Noah, like every true servant of God, preached to himself whenever he preached to others; and, apart from this, it is plain—considering that the persons saved from the Flood were well known to have been, and were constantly thought and spoken of as, a single family of eight persons (cf. Iren. i. 18. 3)—that the apostle, supposing him to be thinking of Christ's preaching through Noah, could not in a sentence like this, if for any reason he wished to specify the number of the saved, speak otherwise than he has done, without an excessive and wholly unnatural fastidiousness regarding precision of expression.

The great strength of the exegesis now under consideration lies in the fact that it—alone of all the proposed interpretations—appears to accord perfectly with the whole structure of the paragraph. The apostle, exhorting persecuted believers to firmness and patience, has it as his leading thought (this

being distinctly shown, as has been seen, when iii. 18, iv. 1, 6, are compared with each other) that suffering for righteousness' sake in the sphere of flesh brings life, joy, power, in the sphere of spirit. He introduces the observations through which this line of thought runs, by speaking of the case of our Redeemer and Forerunner. The Lord suffered in flesh even to death, and in consequence of this was "quickened" —raised to a measure of power and energy such as seemed life from the dead—"in spirit." At this stage of Peter's remarks nothing could possibly be more natural than a reminder given to the reader regarding a work done long before by Christ "in the sphere of spirit," in which, though His gracious pleading had been carried on with signal persistence, there had yet been but little fruit; this reference, of course, serving to bring out most vividly the contrast when, now "quickened," He is bringing multitudes everywhere to salvation. The apostle shows, by two pictures set in contrast, how gloriously had been realized the assurance given of old through the prophets,—and which sounds out in particular so often and so joyously in Isaiah,—that, when Messiah came, there would be a vast increase in the manifestation of spiritual power in the world,—that the gleaning of the grapes in "the acceptable year of the Lord" would be richer far than the vintage of former days. From exact parallelism of form in the contrast the apostle is turned aside by the correspondence which presents itself to him between the water of the Flood, covering the accursed world, that a new and purer world might appear, and the water of baptism, covering the believer's moral defilement, that, old things having passed away, all things may become new. With entire exactness of substance, however, we have, in "Baptism now saves you" (ver. 21), a statement of the wondrous harvest which the "quickening" brings. Detailed antithesis to the ὀλίγοι of ver. 20 is plainly quite superfluous, through the knowledge which all the readers had, and which was their constant wonder and joy, of the rapid and wide diffusion and acceptance of gospel light,—

the simple fact indeed that "*you*"—believers over all parts of Asia Minor—"are being saved," itself sufficiently attesting the glorious progress of salvation. "Observe, too," the apostle continues, "that this salvation comes to you through influences flowing from an immeasurable fulness of power and energy,—through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is now on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven, angels and authorities and powers being made subject to Him" (ver. 22). To all this the words "quickened in spirit" pointed. Thus we are brought with irresistible force to the practical appeal (iv. 1), "Forasmuch, then, as Christ suffered in flesh" (and thereby passed into such fulness of life "in spirit"), "arm ye yourselves also with the same mind."

This mode of exegesis explains quite satisfactorily the use of the anarthrous participle *ἀπειθήσασιν*, in that it states the occasion of *ἐκήρυξεν*; it brings out without any forcing a perfect relevancy in the apostle's dwelling on the long-suffering of God with the antediluvians, and on the fewness, notwithstanding all that patience of gracious dealing, of those who were saved,—statements which otherwise are not accounted for in any satisfying way; and it gives a unity to the whole paragraph.

One marked advantage of this interpretation is that, according to it, the passage is not a specially mysterious one, but contains simply a reference to well-known facts of O. T. history, as seen in the light of N. T. Christology. The view of those expositors who regard the 19th verse as speaking of an event occurring in the unseen world, is one which for the imaginative side of our nature has a special attraction; but, as has been already shown, that very element in the exegesis which stimulates the imagination constitutes, when the structure and connection of the sentence are considered, a most serious difficulty in the way of believing that the supposed sense is that which the apostle meant. The writer appears evidently to intend the exhibition of an illustration, or proof, or argument, the nature of which, and its bearings

on his line of remark, were likely at once to suggest themselves. Nothing whatever in his mode of expression seems to imply that he knew himself to be referring to a matter unmentioned, unhinted at, in any other part of Scripture. Now the interpretation before us answers precisely to the requirements of the case in this respect. The apostle might most safely assume that all his readers knew something of the facts connected with the history of the Flood. It is reasonable to think that, from the awful impressiveness of that judgement, no portion of O. T. history was more familiar to Christians everywhere; and with this supposition the frequency and the form of N. T. references to the Deluge quite accord: cf. Matt. xxiv. 37–39; Luke xvii. 26, 27; Heb. xi. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 5, iii. 6. The "striving of God's Spirit with men" in the time before the Flood is expressly mentioned in Scripture (Gen. vi. 3); and though the fact that the preaching of Noah was one of the instrumentalities employed in this divine "striving" is not there recorded, it was yet, there is every reason to believe, as has been already shown, preserved by tradition and well known. That the "Spirit" who thus wrought graciously among men in O. T. days was "the Spirit of Christ," was, as is shown by his language in i. 11, a thought vividly present to our apostle's mind; and through those words, as well as by other teaching, it had also been brought distinctly before the minds of his readers. Not merely, therefore, from intrinsic fitness to show a most impressive contrast to the saving energy of the "quickened" Lord, but from their familiarity to all his readers, the facts connected with the pleading of Christ through His Spirit with the generation before the Flood, and the small success of this pleading, were plainly admirably suited to Peter's present purpose.

The directness and immediateness, also, of the illustration of the apostle's course of thought, which is given by vv. 19, 20, according to this exegesis, constitute a manifest advantage, when placed in comparison with the peculiarity and remote-

ness of that which the other interpretation presents. In ver. 18 he has said, "Christ died for sins, to the intent that, having been put to death in flesh, quickened in spirit, He might (thus) bring you to God." Now, on that view of the meaning which the exegesis we are now considering exhibits, the "quickening" which was "to bring *you* to God" is directly illustrated by mention (vv. 21, last clause, 22) of the glorious power and energy which were attested by the Lord's resurrection, ascension, and sitting down at the right hand of God,—power and energy through which His gracious dealing "now saves you" (δι' ἀναστάσεως *I. X.*, ver. 21, and by consequence the whole of ver. 22, being in immediate connection with σώζει). That the brightness of this sublime scene of energy and triumph may have its full impressiveness, a background has been prepared in vv. 19, 20, through the detailed description of the little result which followed Christ's gracious and persistent appeals to men in an age before the "quickening"—men living, like ourselves, in the world, and amid similar difficulties and temptations to those which beset us. The illustration thus given of the "quickening" which was intended "to bring *you* to God" has unity, and most plain and direct pertinence. On the other exegesis, the proof of this "quickening" is supplied by mention of the Lord's going after His death and preaching to certain wicked spirits in the regions of woe. Doubtless these were human souls; and if such a visit was paid by Christ, and lost souls saved through His "preaching," this did show that He had been "quickened in spirit;" yet even so it seems a singular and remote illustration of that power which the Lord won through death "to bring *you* to God." But when we consider that not a hint is given of success in this mission,—that why the spirits of the antediluvian sinners in particular were addressed by the Saviour is an entire mystery,—that the relevancy of the details given in ver. 20 of the divine patience with that generation and of the fewness of the saved is, to say the least, far from obvious,—and that the connection

between vv. 19, 20, and those which follow, is, at the best, loose and uncertain, — it must be felt that, as respects precision, lucidity, directness, unity, the exegesis which refers the "preaching" of Christ spoken of to His gracious dealings with the antediluvians while they were on earth, has great advantages.

On the whole, comparing the two modes of interpretation which alone practically are before us,—for that which refers Peter's statement in ver. 19 to Christ's preaching through the apostles is confronted with quite insuperable objections,—it appears that that which supposes the apostle to speak of a preaching by our Lord in the regions of the dead fails either to explain the structure of the sentence in which the statement occurs, or to fit in with the general line of thought in the paragraph; whilst that which regards the reference to be to Christ's gracious pleading with the generation before the Flood while they were living on earth, fulfils both of these requisites of a satisfactory exegesis,—and that there is nothing in the use of words, or in the construction, inconsistent with the view that this is the meaning.

A sketch of the history of exegetical dealing with this passage is given by several commentators, Pott, De Wette, Wiesinger, and others. This history has some points of interest; but the details with regard to what scholar held this view and what scholar that, give in the present case little or no help in the work of exposition. There are circumstances under which such information does supply a measure of aid. It does so when it shows us that of learning, sound judgement, and Christian candour, a decided preponderance is in favour of one particular view. In the present instance there is no help to be obtained in this way. Where we find among the defenders of one position an Athanasius and a Calvin, among the defenders of another a Grotius and a Schöttgen, among the defenders of a third a Scaliger and a Pearson,—where a Bengel and a Leighton are opposed to each other,—and these names representative of many on the various sides of opinion,

—it is plain that in favour of no one of the forms of exegesis is there any approach to a *consensus* of erudition, robustness of intellect, or Christian devoutness and singleness of purpose in the study of Scripture. Again, if a history of the interpretation of a passage show that the Greek commentators, to whom the language of N. T. was native, agree with respect to the force of certain obscure words or of an obscure construction,—or if, from the agreement or the tone of the oldest of them, there may seem to be a likelihood that tradition had brought down from apostolic times to their day some view of the meaning which might possibly at least be from an authoritative source, or knowledge of some fact connected with a statement made in the passage under discussion which may be tributary to its correct interpretation,—an expositor obviously may here find advantage. But in the present case no help of this kind shows itself. On nothing, either in the separate words or in the construction, do the Fathers cast any special light,—nor indeed was there any reason to look for such light, or any need for it, the language employed being common and simple. Neither is there any reason to think that the believers of the immediately post-apostolic Church had any authoritative explanation preserved to them from the earlier day. It is true that there was among the Fathers a strong belief in our Lord's having, during the interval between His death and His resurrection, exerted an activity of some kind among the spirits of the dead. But that this belief was founded on 1 Pet. iii. 19, or indeed that in the earliest ages this passage was looked on as having any bearing on the point at all, there is no evidence. In speaking of the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, which some scholars suppose to be in substance derived from a document of the second century, and which contains a very fantastic account of the Saviour's visiting Hades, Dr. Plumptre—a keen advocate of the view that a visit to Hades is spoken of in our passage—observes that, throughout the whole of the apocryphal writer's narrative, there is no reference to the verses, 1 Pet. iii. 18–20,

iv. 6, "which might have seemed the most natural starting-point for it;" and he goes on frankly to admit that, "whatever may be the right interpretation of those verses, the belief would appear to have had an existence altogether independent of them" (*The Spirits in Prison*, p. 82). Total absence, thus acknowledged, of any reference in the literature of the earliest times to our passage as supporting what we know to have been then a prevalent belief, seems by legitimate inference to tell us somewhat of a negative kind with respect to the exegesis of the passage in the immediately sub-apostolic age. There is abundant proof that our Epistle was from the earliest times one of the most familiar of N. T. writings. To Irenæus, among others, as his quotations show, it was well known. The fact, therefore, that Irenæus, when again and again dealing systematically with the subject of a visit of Christ to the world of the dead, does not even in the slightest way allude to Peter's words,—words which, if they refer to such a visit, are certainly by far the most direct and full with regard to it to be found anywhere in Scripture,—affords strong reason for thinking that in his day (from about 130 A.D. to the end of the century) the passage was not supposed to speak of a preaching in Hades. His chief stay, in maintaining his position, is a passage not found in Scripture, but which he, and Justin Martyr also, believed to belong to the prophecies of Jeremiah or Isaiah. This is quoted or referred to by him four or five times. In the N. T. his appeal is to Eph. iv. 9. Not merely this absence of reference, but also the form in which the belief regarding a visit of the Lord to the region of separate souls was entertained by the Fathers of the second century, shows that it was in no respect based on our passage; for in all of them the position upheld is that in Hades Christ preached to the patriarchs and prophets,—as to which Peter's words give neither statement nor suggestion.

Clement of Alexandria is the first whom we know to have interpreted the words in Peter of a *descensus ad inferos* (*Strom.* vi. 6). Two centuries after his time we find Augustine main-

taining the exegesis which takes Peter's reference to be to the preaching of the pre-incarnate Logos to the antediluvians, and this without a word to indicate that he thought himself to be opposing any current of Church tradition. Whilst he is the first whom we know to have held this view of the meaning, it may, of course, quite possibly have been the prevalent or the sole exegesis from the apostolic time to that of Clement of Alexandria, in the beginning of the third century; and there seems to be reasonable likelihood that it was. The argument against the supposition that the passage was in those early days interpreted of a reference to a visit to Hades, which has been already stated, based on the silence of Irenæus, has all the conditions present which are needed to give validity to an argument of this kind; and the only tenable alternative with respect to the apostle's meaning is the view which commended itself to Augustine. For references to statements of the earlier Fathers as to the supposed visit of Christ to Hades, see a note of Bp. Lightfoot on Ignat. *Magn.* § 9; for references to the later Fathers, Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. v.

Ver. 19. In addition to those points in this verse which have been dealt with in the preceding general discussion, one or two others claim a word of comment. *Καί* may be attached to *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν* with the force of "even;" and so Wiesinger takes it. But, on any exegesis of the passage, this sense of the word here seems to be somewhat abrupt, and hardly natural. The common opinion of expositors is that the meaning is "also," and that the connection of the particle is not specially with "to the spirits in prison," but with the whole statement made in the clause. The use of *καί* in this way in a relative clause which, like the present, is not strictly subordinate, but tends towards being a distinct sentence, is common in N. T., as in the later Greek generally; cf. A. Buttmann, p. 283 (where its force in such circumstances is illustrated by that of the German *auch* in *Was er auch that*). The additional fact set forth in such a clause with regard to the antecedent, may be,

in historical writing, either contemporaneous, or subsequent, or, as on what seems to be the most probable exegesis is the case here, brought in by retrospect: cf. ii. 8; John xxi. 20. The meaning here is, "in which—to remind you, for illustration of the ζωοποιηθῆναι by contrast, of another fact regarding the Lord—He had gone," etc.

That the apostle assumes his readers to be familiar with the history of the Flood, is implied in the definiteness of "to *the* spirits in prison." The wickedness of that generation on which the Flood came, as of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah of a later time, was proverbial; and, if the thought of the pious followed these men into the unseen world, it regarded them as lying under the divine wrath. The force of the apostle's τοῖς then is, "to those of whom you and I have heard so often, and of whom, under the leadings of God's word, we think solemnly as being spirits in prison." —The name πνεύματα is naturally employed of them when looked at, as at this point, in their present disembodied state; cf. Heb. xii. 23; Luke xxiv. 37, 39,—also the similar use of ψυχαί, Rev. vi. 9, xx. 4. There is in the present place, however, an additional element of suitableness in the use of the term πνεύματα. In the connection, the mind is instinctively carried back to "quickened in spirit;" and since, as has been seen, the prominent thought of the apostle in that expression was of "spirit" as being the sphere of moral life, action, influence, he most fitly employs also with regard to those men of whom he here speaks the word which sets forth the fact that they too had moral natures which might have been influenced by Christ. This being the main thought, the mind passes readily, without any sense of force, to ἀπειθήσασιν, which tells of what they did, of how their moral natures acted, when they were embodied spirits.

Ver. 20. On ἀπειθεῖν, cf. ii. 8, note. On ποτέ, cf. ver. 5. —The double compound ἀπεκδέχεσθαι occurs very rarely elsewhere than in N. T., where it is not uncommon. The prepositions in the compound seem naturally to express

special persistence in waiting, somewhat like the English "to wait it out"; and this force well suits the line of thought in the places where the verb occurs, *e.g.* Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25; Phil. iii. 20; Heb. ix. 28. The word is discussed by C. F. A. Fritzsche (*Opusc. Acad.* p. 156), who exhibits its force in the present passage by the translation, *Dei patientia patienter exspectavit* (more exactly *exspectabat*, for the "patient waiting" is set in specially full view by the use of the imperfect *ἀπεξεδέχετο*, in which we have the divine goodness pictorially before us, so to speak, in its endurance from year to year of the obduracy of the wicked). Similarly Bengel represents the thought by *exspectabat donec exspectandi finis erat.* This intensity of earnest waiting is obviously, on that view of the meaning of the passage which has been maintained above, quite in place,—the apostle presenting in the strongest form his statement of the persistence of the pleadings of divine love, in order that the comparative slightness of the spiritual result may be the more marked, and thus the contrast of the spiritual success of the "quickened" Christ all the more vividly felt.—For *μακροθυμία* as ascribed to God the Father or to Christ, cf. Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22; 1 Tim. i. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 15; and as to the precise force of the word, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.*, § 53.—Like the use of *τοῖς* with *πνεύμασιν* in the previous verse, the expression *ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε* also implies acquaintance of the apostle's readers with the history which is referred to; cf. Matt. xxiv. 37; Luke xvii. 26.

The reason of the absence of the article from *κιβωτοῦ* is not altogether obvious. Wiesinger and others account for it on the ground of the familiarity of the name *κιβωτός* as applied to Noah's vessel, from its being used so many times in the narrative of the Flood as given in LXX.,—the word, like *κύριος* and others, whilst in itself general, being assumed to have come, through frequent use with a certain specific application, to be regarded, when applied in that particular way, almost as a proper name. The meaning therefore is

supposed, of course, to be precisely as if the apostle had employed the article. This view would accord with that intimate knowledge of Noah's history which we have already spoken of as assumed in the form of the passage. The only objection to it—but that a serious one—is the absence of evidence that in the case of this particular word the usage was as supposed. In the references of after times to the ark, the article seems to be as regularly attached as it is in the narrative in Genesis; cf. 4 Macc. xv. 31; Matt. xxiv. 38; Luke xvii. 27; Clem. Rom. § 9; Iren. i. 18. 3. In Heb. xi. 7, indeed, *κιβωτόν* is anarthrous, but there the indefinite form "*an* ark" seems to represent the intended shade of thought. The use of the word as a kind of proper name not being proved, therefore, it seems not unlikely that here also we should think of the indefinite force as being intended. This supposition agrees sufficiently with the apostle's practice elsewhere, the omission of the article in order to give full weight to the signification of a substantive by itself being not infrequent with him; cf. i. 10, note on *προφῆται*. Supposing *κιβωτοῦ* thus indefinite, the prominent thought would seem to be of the merciful design of the ark,—"while an ark—a means of deliverance—was a preparing." These words would thus join themselves in effect to the mention which has been made of the divine "long-suffering," and of its "patient waiting," to show the fulness and earnestness of the pleading of the Logos of God with that generation. The slow rising up before them from day to day of what was distinctly and constantly announced by God's servant to be a means of escape from a certainly coming destruction, was in itself a form of "preaching," and gave support to all the other forms. Rhetorically there seems to be a certain special suitableness in this indefinite way of taking *κιβωτοῦ*, in view of that statement of general disregard of the offered deliverance which immediately follows, in the form of a relative clause attached to *κιβωτοῦ*.

The relative clause which exhibits the smallness of the

result of the pleadings of divine grace with the men of Noah's generation has no word indicating the precise nature of its connection with what precedes, no "nevertheless" or "notwithstanding,"—gaining thus in terseness and point: "He preached to the spirits in prison when disobedient aforetime, when the long-suffering of God kept patiently waiting, while an ark was a preparing, — in which few (persons), eight souls to wit, were saved." Every reader feels the power of the specification of the number,—eight persons out of a world.

The words of this clause, while their general meaning is sufficiently clear, may yet be taken with several different shades of meaning. According to a use of διασώζειν, not uncommon in classical writers, and occasionally found in N. T. (Acts xxiii. 24, xxvii. 44, xxviii. 4), we may translate, "into which few, etc., were brought safely through water." This is given on the margin of R. E. V. Grammatically unobjectionable, this view of the meaning cannot be sustained on other grounds. Every reader instinctively feels it to be a strangely imperfect statement of deliverance, that the persons spoken of were brought safely into the ark, when we know that in fact they were, in the ark, brought safely through the perils of the Deluge. But, besides this, the words "through water," connected in this way, assert what contradicts the distinct O. T. statement on the subject (Gen. vii. 4, 7–10), that the Flood did not begin till the patriarch and his family had entered the ark, and been "shut in" by God. But, in perfect consistency with N. T. usage, we may take εἰς in what is known as its pregnant sense (on which cf. v. 12, εἰς ἣν στῆτε, with note), thus obtaining the sense, "in which" (fully exhibited, "*in* which, having been brought by God *into* it") "a few, etc., were carried safely through water" —water which encompassed and threatened to overwhelm them. This is true and graphic, and the view that this was the apostle's meaning might be legitimately supported by the suggestion that there was echoing in Peter's memory

δι' ὕδατος of Ps. lxvi. (lxv. Sept.) 12, and of Isa. xliii. 2,—in each of which passages the words are, as here, attached to a verb compounded with διά (διήλθομεν, διαβαίνῃς), and in each of which also the statement has reference to a divine deliverance. If it were not for the relative clause which follows (ver. 21), this would seem decidedly to be the probable meaning of our passage. The meaning of that clause, however, and the kind of connection which it has with that now before us, prevent our accepting this sense. There we read "which" (that is, water) "in a corresponding way saves you also." This plainly proves, through the "corresponding" and the "also," that in δι' ὕδατος the apostle had been thinking of water, not as a foe threatening to destroy, but as a friend, a bringer of deliverance. This idea does not seem to associate itself very naturally with the local force of the preposition διά, unless with a somewhat undue amount of supplement, "through the midst of the water, which sustained them and bore them out of all peril." It appears therefore likely, though one yields a little reluctantly in this matter to the pressure of seeming exegetical requirements, that the vivid picture given by the local use of διά should be put aside. The compound διασώζειν is freely used as simply a nearly equivalent form (originally rather stronger) for σώζειν: cf. Matt. xiv. 36; Luke vii. 3; Acts xxvii. 43. On the whole it seems that the verb is employed in this way here, and that διά before ὕδατος has its common instrumental force,—the sense of the clause thus being, "in which few, eight souls to wit, were saved through (means of) water."

With the putting aside of the local representation, "passing through water," the relation of the διά in composition to the other διά is interrupted. Neither can διασώζειν well be supposed to have that *stronger* force, as compared with the simple verb, which has just been mentioned as strictly given by the preposition; because in the very next clause, with which to a certain extent the present

is contrasted, the simple verb is employed to describe a deliverance grander by far than that from the Flood. As hinted above, *διασώζειν* had to a great extent lost in use the special, intenser force which it originally possessed: cf. *e.g.* the references to Luke and Acts given just above. The apostle employed the compound here probably partly through the familiar assonance of *διά* in composition with *διά* separate, and partly because though, in the end, the instrumental sense of the preposition as it stands before *ὕδατος* was uppermost in his mind, yet the picture of "passing through the water" was or had been also in a measure before him.

Clement of Rome (§ 9) says, *Νῶε πιστὸς εὑρεθεὶς διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν, καὶ διέσωσεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Δεσπότης τὰ εἰσελθόντα ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ζῶα εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν.* Quite distinct as this statement is from Peter's, still the coming together, in association with the mention of the ark, of the words *ἐκήρυξεν* and *διέσωσεν*, suggests as at least possible that Clement was thinking of our passage. If *παλιγγενεσίαν* were interpreted with a spiritual reference, and something like the idea of the first clause of ver. 21 supposed to be in Clement's mind, the likelihood that Peter's words were floating before him would, of course, be much increased; but (see Lightfoot, *in loc.*) such a view of his meaning does not seem to be at all probable. In any case we cannot gather from the sentence anything with respect to Clement's exegesis of Peter.

By some scholars it has been thought that the use of *ψυχαί* in this clause may have been specially suggested to the apostle by that same thought of moral natures and their relations to the divine Logos, which, as has been seen, we are almost certainly to recognise in *πνεύμασιν* (ver. 19). This is, of course, possible; and there can be no doubt that, whilst the deliverance immediately spoken of was an outward one, yet the main thought intended, in the connection, to stand out before us is that it was through subjection, to a

greater or less extent, to spiritual influences,—through acceptance in some measure of the divine teaching and warnings,—that these eight persons were led to avail themselves of the means of rescue. Still, considering the free use in N. T. of ψυχαί in enumerations (like "souls," often, in English) simply for "persons" (Acts ii. 41, vii. 14, xxvii. 37, according to a common LXX. mode of expression, *e.g.* Gen. xlvi. 15; Ex. i. 5; Deut. x. 22), it hardly seems likely that anything special was intended here in the use of this particular word. The natural view is that, when from the general word ὀλίγοι, "few persons," Peter went on to specify the number, he instinctively adopted the formula familiar to him in enumerations, "eight souls."

Ver. 21. The language of the first clause is condensed, but not to serious obscurity: "which (*i.e.* water), corresponding, now saves you also, baptism." The meaning of this is plainly, "which, as corresponding" or "answering" (that is, the force of the adjective being such as is best represented in English by an adverbial combination, "in a corresponding way"), "now saves you also—that is to say, baptism." The adjective ἀντίτυπον is appositional to ὅ; and then afterwards for distinctness we have βάπτισμα as a second apposition, which comes in quite naturally and intelligibly, though logically the appositional relation is somewhat loose, "water—that is to say, the new covenant ordinance in which water is employed as an emblem."

The apostle does not institute or suggest any extended analogy between the deliverance of Noah and his family and that of Christians, but simply notes the fact that, from some points of view, the water of the Flood might be regarded as having a certain analogy to the water of baptism. As the water of the Flood covered the earth which was accursed, and at the same time bore up God's people in safety, so baptism, when it is that spiritual reality which the apostle goes on to describe, covers and purifies the sin-blighted nature, and brings into salvation. The analogy is brought forward by the apostle

here chiefly, it would appear, to exhibit with liveliness the relation of the picture already presented to that now introduced, by giving prominence to what, though in different ways, was yet common to both scenes of Christ's gracious action, as an agent in the deliverance. "Under His working long ago, water saved but eight persons out of the world: under His working now, as quickened in spirit, water is saving you Asiatic believers, representing, as you know, many thousands over the world."

The translation of *ἀντίτυπον* by "as antitype," or "as antitypical," would be somewhat misleading, through the technical sense—narrower than that of the Greek word as used in N. T. —which these derivatives have in our current theological language. There is no likelihood that the apostle meant us to understand that the water of the Flood was, in the strict theological sense, a "type" of baptism,—mainly intended, that is to say, to exhibit on a lower plane the same principles which baptism sets forth, and thus in a measure to prepare men for the fuller revelation which was to come. That both with reference to judgement and to grace the Flood had a typical force is no doubt true, but as regards the *water*, which is the thing here in hand, the thought of an indication of *grace* in it —while present, as is seen on reflection—is yet only secondary, indeed remote, the immediate and main purpose of the water being the destruction of the ungodly. *Ἀντίτυπος*, as used in N. T., indicates resemblance or correspondence to something prior, accordance with a pattern (*τύπος*). This sense is not, or but very doubtfully, found in classical writers. One meaning which the word has in these is "adverse," and by one or two scholars (as Hammond) this has been thought of as perhaps the sense in our passage, "which on the contrary." *Διὰ ὕδατος* at the close of ver. 20 is then, of course, taken with the force of "through water as hostile or threatening," opposed to which here is *ὑμᾶς σώζει*. But *καί* with *ὑμᾶς*, "you also," and the way in which *ἀντίτυπος* is used in the only other N. T. passage where it occurs, Heb. ix. 24, conclusively set this view

of the meaning of the word aside. The adjective, in its sacred application, does not of itself imply anything with respect to the *quality* of that of which it speaks; but merely intimates that it comes, in time, *second* to the τύπος thought of. The ἀντίτυπον may be inferior, as where of heavenly originals there are earthly, material, temporary counterparts or transcripts (Heb. ix. 24),—or, as in our present passage, superior, as a finished work to a rough model: cf. Lightfoot's note on the Ancient Homily formerly called the 2nd Epistle of Clem. Rom., § 14. In the formularies of the Greek Church the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are called ἀντίτυπα of the body and blood of Christ.

For analogies to the strong expression employed here regarding the efficacy of baptism, ὑμᾶς σώζει, cf. Mark xvi. 16; Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 27; Eph. v. 26; Col. ii. 12; Tit. iii. 5.—Hermas (*Vis.* iii. 3) has a remark on baptism which looks somewhat like a reminiscence of our clause taken in association with the last clause of ver. 20: ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν διὰ ὕδατος ἐσώθη καὶ σωθήσεται.

To obviate misconceptions into which abundant experience proves the proneness of men to fall—and which might, in the present case, appear at first sight to be sustained by the particular comparison here instituted, the deliverance of Noah and his family being of an external kind—the apostle adds a definition of what, in saying that "baptism saves," he means by baptism. He does not by that name designate anything which is merely outward. He means a sincere profession, made in the appointed manner, of subjection of heart to Christ. The ordinance saves, he intimates in substance, not through any action of a material, mechanical kind, but solely as it is a channel for the communication of divine grace, and used in accordance with the divine intention. "Debemus in baptismo agnoscere spirituale lavacrum: debemus illic testimonium remissionis peccatorum et renovationis nostræ pignus amplecti: sic tamen relinquere et Christo et Spiritui Sancto suum honorem, ut nulla pars salutis ad signum transferatur" (Calvin).

For distinctness and impressiveness the apostle describes what he means both negatively and positively. In the first place, by "baptism," as he has used the word in the statement just made by him, he means "not a putting away of filth of flesh" (that is, "not an outward or bodily purification," *σάρξ* being used throughout the Epistle with this force only, though the adjective *σαρκικός* has the ethical reference, ii. 11). From the arrangement of the words some interpreters are disposed to regard the genitives as both governed by *ἀπόθεσις*, with different references (so in N. T. occasionally, *e.g.* Phil. ii. 30), *σαρκός* being subjective and *ῥύπου* objective, "flesh's putting away of filth." The ascription of action in this way to *σάρξ*, however, is plainly not natural; and though, supposing *σαρκός* to be governed by *ῥύπου*, the order is certainly unusual, yet there is an exact parallel in Rev. vii. 17, *ζωῆς πηγὰς ὕδατος*. The explanation, no doubt, is that *σαρκός* had in the apostle's mind the emphasis of antithesis, his thought, though in the second part he deviates from precise exactness in the expression of it, being *οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου ἀλλὰ πνεύματος καθαρισμός*, or something similar.—An interesting parallel to the statement of the apostle here, though with a somewhat different immediate reference, is found in Justin Martyr (*Tryph.* 14) when speaking of the Jewish lustrations, *τί γὰρ ὄφελος ἐκείνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ὃ τὴν σάρκα καὶ μόνον τὸ σῶμα φαιδρύνει; βαπτίσθητε τὴν ψυχήν.*

Of the positive part of the apostle's definition the words which are used, and the context, make the general meaning sufficiently clear, — "but sincere surrender to God." The exact form of the thought, however, is very far from being clear,—the obscurity being adequately represented in R. E. V. by "but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God," with two marginal alternative renderings for "interrogation," "inquiry" and "appeal." We have in the words that ambiguity which not unfrequently arises from the fact that the genitive may be subjective or objective, uncertainty also what *ἐπερώτημα* as here employed means, and doubt regarding the

precise connection and force of εἰς. The noun ἐπερώτημα occurs in N. T. here only, but the verb ἐπερωτάω often. As the simple verb ἐρωτάω has freely in Hellenistic use, like our English "ask," the sense of "request, petition" (whether the appeal be addressed to God—so *e.g.* John xvii. 9, 20; 1 John v. 16—or to man), as well as the classical meaning "put a question," so the compound ἐπερωτάω, whilst usually "question" (*e.g.* Luke ii. 46; 1 Cor. xiv. 35), means in Matt. xvi. 1, "request." Similarly in LXX. the verb has generally (*e.g.* Gen. xxvi. 7; Ezek. xiv. 7, 10) the force of "question;" yet in Ps. cxxxvii. (cxxxvi.) 3, it has unequivocally the sense of "request." In Dan. ii. 10, 11, also, this is possibly the meaning, but more probably "question." The substantive is found in O. T. Greek in Dan. iv. 17 (14) only, where its meaning almost certainly is "request." As used by classical writers, the meaning of the word is "question." Every rendering of the apostle's language, which from these data seems to be possible, has found supporters; "inquiry proceeding from, and inquiry or examination addressed or applied to, a good conscience," "petition from, and petition for, a good conscience," "the petitioned-for boon of a good conscience" (ἐπερώτημα being in this case regarded as having that passive force which strictly belongs to nouns in -μα); εἰς taken with the force of "to, toward," or with that of "in reference to," and joined to "inquiry" or "petition," or to "conscience." Another class of renderings, too, has been thought of. It is not unnatural to suppose that in the apostle's words there is a reference to that questioning which, certainly from very early times, and perhaps from the apostolic age, preceded the administration of the rite of baptism. An early formula was *Ἀποτάσσῃ τῷ Σατανᾷ; Ἀποτάσσομαι. Συντάσσῃ τῷ Χριστῷ; Συντάσσομαι.* Reference here to such catechizing being assumed, the apostle's word has been supposed to cover the whole of this transaction, and to point in the present case chiefly to the *answering*—as sometimes in modern English the word "examination" is employed with reference mainly

to the answers. An application of ἐπερωτᾶσθαι and its cognates, somewhat of this kind, resting on the usual system of bargaining by question and answer in the transactions of common life, is found in the later Byzantine legal phraseology —the words being employed with the force of "stipulating, engaging, promising." Thus we come to a possible rendering of our passage, "the engagement, or promise, toward God of a good conscience,"—that is, either subjectively, "given by a good conscience," or objectively, "to maintain a good conscience." The view that ἐπερώτημα here is to be taken somewhat in this way, as used metonymically, or with a broadened reference, has commended itself to a great many excellent interpreters (as Beza, Grotius, De Wette, Lillie), and has led to such renderings as "in that a good conscience consenteth to God" (Tyndale), and "the answer of a good conscience toward God" (A. E. V.). Whilst, however, the meaning thus given is in a measure satisfactory, it seems questionable whether it has not been reached rather *a priori*, by a consideration of what the apostle might suitably say, than by an altogether legitimate dealing with what he has said. The metonymy of "answer" for "question" is a strong one, and can hardly be accepted without some proof of contemporary usage. Now there is no evidence that that particular application of ἐπερωτᾶσθαι, and words derived from it, which has been mentioned above as made in the technical language of the later Greek lawyers, was in use in the first century. No doubt, quite conceivably, the words with this application may have passed into Byzantine use from the legal phraseology of some of the Eastern provinces, where they may have been so employed for centuries. Of this, however, there is no proof. It being certain, moreover, that no use of the word or its cognates with anything like such a meaning occurs in LXX., N. T., or the early Fathers, one finds it difficult to imagine that, even if the apostle and the Christians of Asia Minor knew ἐπερώτημα as so applied, he would be in the least likely, in a connection like the present, to

employ it in a sense which had no sacred associations whatever, and was known merely of buying and selling, and that only or mainly in technical law. It may reasonably be doubted, therefore, whether the assumption of a metonymical use of ἐπερώτημα in the passage is justified.

On the other hand, if we are thrown back on the sense of "inquiry" or "petition" as alone legitimate (so, among others, Bp. Lightfoot, referring to the point in his book, *On the Revision of A. V.*, p. 136), it may be felt that no one of the possible meanings seems quite to fill up what is naturally looked for in a definition of the spiritual significance of baptism. It is to be remarked, however, that the definition is brought in in an altogether informal, occasional, parenthetical way, simply to give an incidental suggestion of the true line of thought on the matter. Those renderings which appear to have any considerable measure of likelihood are the following: — *First*, "the inquiry of a good conscience after God:" so Bretschneider, Winer, Alford. This rendering is supported by a reference to 2 Sam. xi. 7, where we read ἐπηρώτησε Δαυὶδ εἰς εἰρήνην Ἰωάβ. To this view the objection presents itself, that, whilst true religion may well be described as a continued seeking or inquiring after that spiritual knowledge of God and of His Son Jesus Christ, which "is life eternal" (John xvii. 3), yet as a definition, however informal, of baptism, "an inquiry after God" does not seem natural or specially pertinent, seeing that baptism is rather a public testimony to having already positively learned something in this sublime field of research, to having taken the first great step in the knowledge of God. *Secondly*, "inquiry addressed by a good conscience to God:" so Gerhard, Besser, Salmond, and perhaps R. E. V. *Thirdly*, "a petition addressed by a good conscience to God:" so Bengel, Schmid, and the Geneva English Version ("in that a good conscience maketh request to God"). In these two renderings there is obviously something of vagueness and incompleteness. Gerhard, for example, has to supplement

"an inquiry addressed to God" by "quomodo Deus erga baptizatum affectus sit;" and Besser, in the direct form, "Art not Thou my Father? Am I not Thy child?" Similarly Steiger—who appears to hesitate between these two views of the meaning, somewhat preferring "inquiry"—supplements his rendering thus, "with regard to salvation,"—"of which the person receiving baptism longs to have assurance." On neither of these translations, moreover, do the apostle's words seem to have anything like special suitableness to serve as a statement of the spiritual significance of baptism. *Fourthly*, "a petition addressed to God for a good conscience:" so Lechler, Weiss, Hofmann, Wiesinger. This appears to be, on the whole, the most satisfactory view. The thought as given by it is distinct, and expressed with adequate fulness, and has plainly a special relevancy to the matter in hand. The fact that the mention of "water" is what has introduced the allusion to baptism leads a reader to anticipate with confidence that anything which is said regarding the meaning of the ordinance will deal with it not merely in its general aspect, as the beginning of a Christian profession, but to some extent with respect to the specific teaching of the emblem employed. This is most unequivocally the case with the negative part of the definition, "not a putting away of filth of flesh;" and in the positive part the mind, beyond doubt, expects something which at least approaches to the nature of a direct antithesis to the negative, some statement of that spiritual purification which to the eye of faith is pictured in baptism. The position of a sincere and intelligent receiver of baptism is that of one who solemnly engages to be pure in heart and life, through the promised grace of the Holy Spirit. Now the apostle in the present section of his letter, and indeed only a few lines before (ver. 16, where see note), has exhorted his readers to "have a good conscience" (cf. also ii. 19). No form of expression, therefore, could more naturally present itself to him here to describe spiritual purity than this; and it appears natural also, and quite in accordance with the general style

of apostolic teaching, that, having in the former place made mention of the duty, he should now, when speaking of the baptismal pledge to do the duty, point directly to where the strength for doing it is to be found, and how it is to be obtained. In making his baptismal engagement the sincere Christian is praying, and that with intensity. Thus "an entreaty addressed to God for a good conscience" seems to be Peter's meaning.

Some expositors have attached the words δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ immediately to συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς, or to ἐπερώτημα. No connection of this kind seems to be justified, however, because the words "through the resurrection of Jesus Christ" stand in such close association with the following verse that it would go with them in the construction, and thus we should have an entire overthrow of the balance of the sentence,—an incidental elucidation of the spiritual significance of baptism drawing with it the whole of the latter part, whilst the principal statement ὑμᾶς σώζει would be without a word of illustration. The sense, too, which is obtained by joining δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰ. Χ. with σώζει being, to say the least, not less satisfactory than that given by the other connection, we may safely hold the construction with σώζει to be that which the writer intended.

Having so defined baptism as to show that, when he ascribes a saving efficiency to "water," he is not attributing this virtue to anything which is merely outward, Peter proceeds here to show that the salvation spoken of is really and wholly through Christ. Earlier in the Epistle he has repeatedly pointed to the resurrection and heavenly glory of the Lord Jesus as the object through the believing contemplation of which Christian hope has its life (i. 3, 21). Here salvation itself is set forth as coming to us through His resurrection. In ver. 18 the Lord's atoning sufferings and death have been spoken of: at the stage which we have now reached, the apostle's thought has regard to the *application* of redemption, to the work done by Christ when, after and

through His death, "quickened in spirit." With what a magnificent sweep he brings before us the evidence of the completeness of the "quickening," and thus the ground which we have for assurance of the glorious success of His work as a Saviour in these gospel times,—in contrast with the little fruit of His pleadings with the sinners before the Deluge! "The water which bore up the ark that sheltered God's people saved but few,—but eight out of a numerous generation,—though the Word of God had been for many years graciously pleading with men to repent and live: the water which correspondingly saves you has its power through the resurrection of the Incarnate Word, which has attested His triumph over all the force of death and hell. Your Representative and Lord, who died for you, is risen from the dead for you, to be a quickening Spirit, to be the Resurrection and the Life. The power of His resurrection is perpetuated, for He is now at the right hand of God, in surpassing glory and invested with boundless authority. He has gone to heaven, and the loftiest of God's creatures are made subject to Him. How sublime in kind, in degree, in extent, must the salvation be which He gives, thus wondrously quickened in spirit,—His measureless grace wielding measureless power to influence moral natures, to guide and sustain and bless!" Something like this would seem to be the line of thought in the last words of ver. 21 and in ver. 22: cf. Peter's words in Acts ii. 32, 33; also Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; Heb. vii. 25.

Ver. 22. The arrangement of the clauses shows clearly that the apostle desired to pass at once from mention of the historic event of the resurrection of the Lord to the statement of His present position, thus bringing out the continued fulness of His life and saving power. Then by participles he mentions two facts, the view of which contributes to the depth and distinctness of our impression of the glory of the "quickened" Saviour. Reference to the session of Christ at the right hand of God is very abundant in N. T., *e.g.* Rom.

viii. 34 ; Eph. i. 20 ; Heb. i. 3,—the foundation passage on the subject, Ps. cx. (cix. Sept.) 1, being also expressly cited a considerable number of times, *e.g.* Matt. xxii. 44 ; Acts ii. 34 ; Heb. i. 13.—A clause which the Vulgate adds here, *deglutiens mortem, ut vitæ æternæ heredes efficeremur*, while no doubt merely a gloss, is yet interesting, as showing how, in the mind of the early Bible student who wrote it, the thought of Christ as "quickened in spirit," and thus become with glorious fulness the Life-giver, ran as the main thought through the paragraph.

The participial clause *πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν* has much interest. If we looked on the verse as being simply an unimpassioned list of facts connected with the Saviour's exaltation, it might seem as if, according to the arrangement adopted by the apostle, the mention of this particular fact was almost superfluous,—the main statement already made, that He is at God's right hand, presupposing His having gone to heaven. But just here enters the special importance of Peter's words. It is quite clear that this thought, *πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν*, rose up before the apostle's mind as one which to himself brought home with peculiar vividness a sense of the glory of the Lord. Now there seems to be no natural way of accounting for this, except by his memory's giving him a picture of that scene on Olivet when, while blessing His apostles, Jesus "was parted from them and carried up into heaven." The great event of the Ascension of Christ is related in but a very few passages of N. T., probably because it was thought of by the first Christians simply as being the completion or legitimate sequel of the resurrection. Even of those few passages which do state it, moreover, one or two are vexed with serious textual difficulties. It is of no little moment, then, to have from an eye-witness, like the Apostle Peter, what cannot be naturally explained but as a distinct historic reminiscence. The same remembrance is very probably actually present in *δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα* of i. 21, but is not so obvious.

The genitive absolute clause with which the verse closes contains an expansion of a part of what is implied in ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ Θεοῦ. The inhabitants of heaven are placed in subjection to Christ. The words ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων, taken by themselves, might apply to earthly powers (cf. Luke xii. 11; Tit. iii. 1), the whole combination thus describing the mediatorial authority of the Lord over heaven and earth; but the abruptness of the transition from ἀγγέλων, and the fact that in several other passages (*e.g.* Eph. i. 21, iii. 10; Col. i. 16) ἐξουσία and kindred words are grouped to describe orders of the heavenly hierarchy, lead quite decidedly to the judgement that this is what was in the apostle's mind here. The natural construction is not to subordinate the latter terms in the group to "angels," "angels (both authorities and powers)," but to co-ordinate the three, "angels and authorities and powers,"—the aim of the combination being, as is manifest, simply to illustrate the might and glory of Jesus by declaring that all those exalted spirits who compass the throne of God, by whatever name they may be known, obey the behest of Him who once hung upon the cross and lay in the grave. The differences in the words which are employed in the various passages referred to above, and the variety in the order of their arrangement in the groups, show clearly that the sacred writers did not mean to teach anything with respect to the details of the distinctions existing among the inhabitants of heaven. The groupings are made merely for general impression. "For the Christian faith there suffices the testimony as to different degrees and categories in the angelic world, while any attempt to ascertain more than is written in Scripture passes into the fanciful domain of theosophy" (Meyer on Col. i. 16). Lightfoot, in his note on the same passage in Colossians, gives a sketch of some of the speculations of Jewish and Judæo-Christian theosophies with respect to the grades of the heavenly spirits.

CHAPTER IV.

Vv. 1–4. The division of chapters is not at all happily made here, the first six verses of chap. iv. being in very close connection with the last five of chap. iii. At iii. 18, as has been seen, the apostle began an argument in support of the statement made by him in the previous verse to his persecuted brethren, that it is "a good thing" (meaning by this both that it is morally excellent and that, from every worthy point of view, it brings advantage) to suffer for righteousness' sake. His position is that such suffering in the lower sphere, the material, σάρξ, brings life, power, energy in the higher—that of the moral nature, πνεῦμα. This he has illustrated by the case of our Divine Forerunner. He was "put to death in flesh" and thereby "quickened in spirit" (ver. 18),—introduced into a measureless plenitude of saving power (vv. 21, 22), which stands in striking contrast with the small success of His work of grace in the ages preceding the dying and quickening (vv. 19, 20). At iv. 1 comes the direct exhortation based on all this. "Your Forerunner, then, having suffered in flesh" ("and this" as, of course, in the connection, the thought inevitably goes on, "with such glorious issues"), "be ye also ready to suffer."

The form in which the apostle couches his exhortation seems to show that the choice open to those whom he was addressing presented itself to him as one simply of alternatives. From the essential antagonism between "the world" —the aggregate of carnal hearts—and Christ, and from the excitement of feeling which had arisen among the heathen throughout Asia Minor, there was no middle course between

living freely as these heathen lived and accepting "suffering" of some kind "in flesh." Thus the appeal is "Resolve, and that unflinchingly, to suffer, not to sin. Surely your profession as Christians implies that you feel your past life to be enough to have given to sin (vv. 1–3); and, indeed, those calumnies and persecutions with which you are now beset are due simply to the wonderment and irritation of those around you at the evidence which you have already been giving that you feel this" (ver. 4).

Ver. 1. The T. R. reads in the first clause *παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί*, and in the last *ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκί*. The changes which, on ample evidence, criticism has made, omitting *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* in the one place and *ἐν* in the other, render the apostle's course of thought more obvious. When the true reading in the two clauses respectively is seen to be simply *παθόντος σαρκί*, *παθὼν σαρκί*, the expression, repeated in so marked a way, and standing out in its bareness and generality, at once leads the mind unhesitatingly to recognise a parallelism with *θανατωθεὶς σαρκί* in the first verse of the paragraph (iii. 18) and with *κριθῶσι σαρκί* in the last verse (iv. 6),—and to consider that a prominent thought—the governing thought, in fact—in the apostle's mind throughout the paragraph is that of the antithesis which is fully expressed in the first and last of the places, suffering in flesh and life in spirit. With *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* read in the first clause, moreover, the chief force of that clause is the setting forth of the motive of gratitude to the great Atoner: with these words left out, the relation of the Lord to His people that comes into the foreground is that of Example,—which vv. 17, 18 of chap. iii. have led us to expect.

Those temptations which, through the action of fear, connect themselves with a state of persecution, are, as strong and bitter foes, to be opposed by the Christian suitably armed: "do ye also arm yourselves with the same mind" (on the figure cf. particularly Eph. vi. 10–17). Sophocles (*Elect.* 995, 996) has an interesting parallel to the mode of expression

here, in the combination *θράσος ὁπλίζεσθαι*. The simple verb *ὁπλίζειν* occurs here only in N. T.; the compound *καθοπλίζειν* in Luke xi. 21.

Occasionally in classical writers (see the Lexicons), according to a development illustrated in all languages, *ἔννοια*, "a thought," has the idea of *purpose* more or less definitely present. This is found also in the Hellenistic use of the word (Susann. 28); and indeed its meaning in LXX. seems generally to include with thought also the affections and resolutions naturally connecting themselves with such thought (cf. Prov. iii. 21, v. 2). This is apparently its force in our passage, and is adequately represented by "mind" (of both A. and R. E. V.), —"the same mind" meaning "the same conviction of the absolute hatefulness of sin, and the same spirit of determination to suffer to any extent in order that sin may be overthrown." Elsewhere in N. T. *ἔννοια* occurs only in Heb. iv. 12 (there in the plural), where both versions give "intents."

The exact force of the statement in the last clause, "he that hath suffered in flesh hath ceased (or, taken passively, been brought to a cessation) unto (with regard to) sins," is not altogether obvious; but consideration of the context aids to a determination of the meaning. A mystical sense of *παθών* has been thought of, as referring to death with Christ in baptism (Schott, Webster and Wilkinson), or to the crucifixion of the old nature (Calvin, Gerhard); but this is not natural. *Παθόντος* of the first clause is unquestionably literal, and the aim of the whole paragraph is to give support in literal physical suffering from persecution. The unmistakeable and emphatic reference in the repeated "hath suffered in flesh" to the closing words of iii. 18, suggests in a decided way that in the present clause the expression "has come to an end with relation to sins" answers to "has been quickened in spirit," presenting this in a special aspect suited to the hortatory character of the sentence. The subject is general,—"he who (every one who) has suffered in flesh" (that is, of course, as distinctly indicated by the drift of the whole paragraph, "who

has suffered in flesh *for righteousness' sake*"). From the manifest reference of the words of this clause to those of the first, it is clear that our Lord is included in the category intended. The view, however, of some scholars (as Fronmüller) who deny the generality of the subject, making ὁ παθών designate Christ only, is discordant with the indications given by the form of expression,—the natural mode of setting forth this idea being plainly by παθών alone without the article, thus, "because, having suffered, he hath ceased," etc.

Whilst the general statement is true both of the Lord and of His people, yet, as of necessity is the case whenever in any representation of His fellowship with them thought of relation to sin enters, the aspect is different. The sinless Sinbearer ended, when He died, His relation to sin pressing on Him as a burden. Thenceforth He is χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας (Heb. ix. 28). When any of His people are called on to suffer unto death for His sake, that stroke of the persecutor which closes their earthly life closes therewith for ever all the influence of sin over them, dismissing them to the life of perfect holiness and to the enjoyment of the specially glorious crown of the martyr. The strong word πέπαυται naturally suggests that this case, that of death for adherence to God's cause,—the closest possible analogy in the experience of the Lord's people to His,—was prominent in the apostle's mind. He recalled, it may be, this instance and that of which he had heard, of persecution even to this point among the Christians of Asia Minor (cf. the very emphatic expression τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει, ver. 12), and, looking forward to yet more trying days which were approaching, he longed to "strengthen his brethren."

His words, however, are evidently meant to cover much more than a reference to the comparatively rare case of a martyr's death. Every sincere and intelligent acceptance, with a brave and patient heart, of any manifestation of the world's hostility to us because we follow Christ, is a spiritual victory,—sin and Satan being in so far cast down, and an impressive testimony given to our having in heart completely broken

with them, our having "ceased from," "ended," love and subservience to sin. Proof shown in this way that the soul has received "not a spirit of fearfulness, but of power" (2 Tim. i. 7), secures for it a well-marked new stage for the attainment of yet higher practical conformity to the divine will. A note of triumph thus rings out from *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίαις*, precisely as from *ζωοποιηθεὶς πνεύματι* in iii. 18; and the clause sets forth a most powerful and invigorating motive: "Arm yourselves with holy resolution to follow Christ in suffering for righteousness, because he who has suffered in flesh has come to an end with regard to sins, thus gaining the position which as Christians you most desire." In addition to the stimulus afforded by the simple statement of this fact, the truth which is always the supreme support of Christ's people—that, namely, of His victory already won, and of their spiritual union to the Conqueror—is also implied in the form in which the statement is made. "In the world ye have tribulation, but be of good cheer,—I have overcome the world" (John xvi. 33). On the clause before us, Rom. vi. 7 should be compared: though the thought here is different, literal suffering and death, not mystical, being spoken of, still it is difficult to think that that verse was not more or less definitely before our apostle's memory.

There are scarcely data for determining whether *πέπαυται* is to be regarded as a passive, "has been made to cease," in which case the Divine Agent and the instrumental action of the suffering are directly suggested to the mind ("by God's grace, through the trial"),—or as a middle, meaning simply "has ceased." The perfect of this verb does not occur elsewhere in N. T. The LXX. use of it—as in Isa. xxiv. 8, xxxiii. 8—appears to be middle. The perfect of the compound *ἀναπαύομαι* is found in 2 Cor. vii. 13, Philem. 7, in both places with passive meaning.

The clause may be taken, and has been by many (as Bengel, Brown, Wiesinger), as stating what the *ἔννοια* (in this case simply "thought and conviction") was,—*ὅτι* being rendered

not "because," but "that." The sense is satisfactory,—"Arm yourselves with the conviction that to suffer for obedience to the will of God is a triumph over sin." But *τὴν αὐτήν* presents a difficulty. These words in themselves may mean one of two things,—either that this "thought" was "the same" which sustained the Lord Jesus in His sufferings, or that the apostle would have those whom he addresses to hold this sentiment *unanimously*, each believer cherishing "the same thought" with his brethren. This latter meaning is in the connection untenable, because thus the exhortation would proceed without any reference at all to the first clause of the verse, with which plainly from the mode of expression it is intended to be very closely associated. Accepting then the other view of the sense as the true one, "the same thought which sustained the Lord," two objections present themselves to our going on with "namely, that," etc. *First*, in this case the exhortation is not quite what the opening clause of the verse leads a reader to expect. From "Christ having suffered in flesh," the direct hortatory deduction is simply "Arm yourselves with the same mind" (that is, "Be ye ready also to suffer"),—any reference to a special sentiment which had animated the Lord coming in, if at all, as a distinct thought. *Secondly*, whilst the "thought" ascribed to the Lord is in itself suitable, being indeed substantially that implied in the statement made in Heb. xii. 2, that "for the joy which was set before Him He endured the cross," yet the form in which it is here presented—as a general proposition, and that expressed somewhat peculiarly—seems to be such as would not naturally have been chosen for a sentiment attributed directly to our Lord, unless it had been well known as enunciated by Himself. Now nothing at all resembling it is recorded as having been uttered by Jesus. On the whole, therefore, there seems to be good ground for considering the clause not to set forth the contents of the *ἔννοια*, but to exhibit a motive in support of the exhortation "Arm yourselves,"—*ὅτι* thus meaning "because."—With reference to the

reading *ἁμαρτίαις*, see Critical Notes; and on this free use of the *dat. comm. et incomm.*, frequent in N. T., cf. ii. 24, *ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι*, with note.

Ver. 2. The question presents itself whether this verse is to be regarded as a continuation of the clause introduced by *ὅτι* (so A. E. V.) or to be connected immediately with the imperative clause, "Arm yourselves with the same mind" (so R. E. V., giving the other on the margin). The former of these views is beset with difficulties. *First*, our verse, so taken, is but a somewhat enfeebling expansion of the striking, pointed, forcible statement, *πέπαυται ἁμαρτίαις*. *Secondly*, on this connection the words *τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ χρόνον* imply that the case of *death* by martyrdom—which, as has been seen, seems to be naturally thought of as the most prominent case in *ὁ παθὼν σαρκί* of ver. 1—is not included at all. *Thirdly*, this verse, implying evidently, as it does, what is distinctly expressed in ver. 3, that in the earlier part of the life of those spoken of there had been sin, would, if joined to the clause introduced by *ὅτι*, exclude the Lord Jesus entirely from the category intended by *ὁ παθὼν σαρκί*,—thus making the structure of the first verse far from natural, and materially weakening the force of the motive exhibited by *ὅτι*. To connecting the verse immediately with the imperative there is no objection, further than that the sentence thus conceived is a little loose in its texture, so that our idiom would perhaps repeat the exhortation,—"Arm yourselves, I say, with the same mind, so as no longer," etc. The apostle thus illustrates the *aim* of his injunction, and this on the lines of the intermediate clause, which has spoken of suffering for righteousness' sake as a triumph over sin.

In *μηκέτι* and *τὸν ἐπίλοιπον χρόνον* there is plainly a tautology, of a kind very natural in a sentence of intensely earnest pleading expressed in the free language of a familiar letter. The genesis of it may have been that when *μηκέτι* was written, the apostle did not intend to mention time again, but, as he went on with the clause, the thought which he expresses

in the next verse, "Sufficient is the past time for sin," rose up before him so vividly that he instinctively brought in here by anticipation "the rest of the time," — which he trusted would be given to holiness. The datives *ἐπιθυμίαις* and *θελήματι* may be explained either as datives of advantage, "for," *i.e.* "doing service to," or as datives of rule, standard, "according to" (cf. Acts xxi. 21; Gal. vi. 16; and see Winer, p. 270; A. Buttmann, p. 184). The fact that the former of these constructions occurs immediately before (*ἁμαρτίαις* of ver. 1, on which see note) makes it likely that here also the apostle's thought took the same mould.—By the generality of his mode of expression, *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις* (contrast the strictly personal form, i. 14, *ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις*), and by his using also the similar *τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν* in ver. 3, the apostle shows us clearly what his course of thought is (see introductory note on vv. 1–4). Prominent in his mind, evidently, at this point, is not thought of the moral weakness and perversity of the professing Christians themselves, but of the demands and influences of the wicked around. "The case is one of alternatives, with no middle course possible. Your lives must be given either to compliance with the will of God (and this involves suffering in flesh) or to compliance with the evil desires of men. Your Christian profession intimates that you have chosen to serve God; arm yourselves then with the mind of Christ, a readiness to bear patiently every evil which the hostility of the world may bring you,—that thus you may serve the Lord fully."— Bengel well calls attention to the plural *ἐπιθυμίαις*, marking the innumerable and often conflicting directions of worldly lusts, in contrast with the singular *θελήματι*, the one all-perfect, absolutely harmonious will of God. On the issues of devotion to "the lusts of men" and to "the will of God" respectively, see 1 John ii. 17.

Ἐπίλοιπος, a common word in the classics and in LXX., occurs here only in N. T.—On *ἐν σαρκὶ βιοῦν*, cf. *ἐν σαρκὶ ζῆν*, Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 22. It will be observed that

throughout this paragraph, wherever expressly or by implication the apostle uses *σαρκί* as antithetic to *πνεύματι*, and as one of the main words in his course of thought (iii. 18, iv. 1 *bis*, 6), he presents it in the bare form *σαρκί*, without a preposition. The place now before us, in which *ἐν* is used, is obviously quite distinct from these.—The verb *βιοῦν* is not found elsewhere in N. T. The 1st aorist, used here, is somewhat rare; the 2nd aorist *ἐβίων* being more common. By the Hellenistic writers, however, *ἐβίωσα* seems to have been preferred; cf. Wisd. xii. 23; Ecclus. xl. 28. On the distinctions between *βιοῦν* and *ζῆν*, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 27.

Ver. 3. An argument in support of the preceding exhortation. Life according to the "lusts of men" is sketched in its most repulsive features, to impress the reader with a sense of the madness and enormity of continuing such a life,—which, as we have seen that the line of thought obviously implies, was the only way of avoiding "suffering in flesh" through the hostility of the heathen. "Arm yourselves with the mind of Christ, that ye may do the will of God,—for surely your past life is long enough for you to have given to that frivolous and impure revelry, which, enlightened as you are by the gospel, you cannot but see to be altogether unworthy of rational and immortal creatures, and utterly offensive in the eye of a holy God. And what profit had ye then in the things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death."

As in the latter part of the sentence the apostle piles up his list of forms of wickedness, his readers could not but think of every moment which had been spent in these with shame and horror, as having been deplorably squandered. The rhetorical understatement (*λιτότης* or *μείωσις*), found in the application to a time regarding which they must have had such feelings, of the mild, indeed colourless, word *ἀρκετός*, constitutes obviously a grave irony, and has peculiar quiet force. It is not impossible that, in using this mode of expression here, some remembrance of Ezek. xliv. 6, xlv. 9, was before the apostle's

mind. The LXX., however, does not use *ἀρκετός* or *ἀρκεῖ* there, but *ἱκανούσθω ὑμῖν*. A certain specialty of force lies perhaps also in the compound *κατειργάσθαι*, "to have wrought efficiently, accomplished;" but this verb is occasionally used in such a way as to prevent our feeling certain that in the present case the preposition is meant to give peculiar strength; cf. *e.g.* Rom. i. 27, ii. 9. As to the complementary infinitive *κατειργάσθαι* after *ἀρκετός* (*ἐστιν*), see Winer, p. 401; A. Buttmann, p. 259.—In *τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν*—that is, the mode of life which those who have not the light of God's revelation desire for themselves, and love to see followed by those around them—Peter in substance repeats *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις* of ver. 2 (on which see note), in a form somewhat stronger, and answering with exactness to the actual position of his readers. The transition (according to the true reading) from the use of *θέλημα* in ver. 2 to that of the synonym *βούλημα* here is perhaps due to an instinctive, reverential shrinking from employing with reference to men who were alienated from God a word which had just been used of God Himself. The change can hardly be ascribed to any special inherent suitableness of the one word to the one application, and of the other to the other; for in Rom. ix. 19, *βούλημα* is said of God, and *θέλημα*, whilst predominantly said of God, yet is also, not very unfrequently (*e.g.* John i. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 37; Eph. ii. 3), used of men. The line of demarcation between the force of *θέλω* and that of *βούλομαι* is hard to define with precision.—On the frequent N. T. use of *ἔθνη* with relation to religion and not to race, cf. ii. 12, note.

The verb *πορεύεσθαι*, employed Hebraistically (like *περιπατεῖν*) for a course of life, is construed, as here, with *ἐν* (of the various paths, or the various fields through which the paths lead) in Luke i. 6, 2 Pet. ii. 10; elsewhere with the simple dative (as Acts ix. 31), or with *κατά* (as 2 Pet. iii. 3). The apostle uses here the participle of the perfect, instead of what might seem more natural, that of the imperfect. This is analogous to the case, common in N. T., of an aorist participle

joined to a main verb in the aorist and coincident with it in time. The choice of *πεπορευμένους* instead of *πορευομένους* accords strikingly with the tone of the whole sentence, one obviously of intense desire that the time of "working the will of the Gentiles" should be regarded as absolutely done with. As to the use of the accusative *πεπορευμένους*, the construction preferred in N. T. in a clause of this kind, instead of making the participle agree with *ὑμῖν* (understood with *ἀρκετός*), cf. Winer, p. 782; A. Buttmann, p. 305. In the present place, the fact that *ὑμῖν* is not expressed would have made the dative of the participle hardly natural.

In a catalogue of vices given in the course of an impassioned exhortation, punctiliously sharp discrimination with regard to the spheres which respectively the different names cover is not intended nor needed, what is aimed at being general impression. In the list given by the apostle here the first two names probably overlap each other to some extent, and also the following three. The main division is sufficiently clear, and is approximately represented by "debauchery, dissipation, and impiety," — "debauchery" answering to *ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις*, "dissipation" to *οἰνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, πότοις*, whilst "impiety" represents in a somewhat loose way *ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις*. All the nouns, it will be observed, are put in the plural, in order to bring out impressively the habitual wickedness of average heathen life, the frequency and variety of its acts of grossness.

Ἀσέλγεια (a word of uncertain etymology) is "wantonness, regardlessness of all restraints,"—often with special reference to fleshly impurity (as Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 19), but also more generally (so apparently, from the arrangement of the names of vices, in Mark vii. 22). On this word, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 16.—*Ἐπιθυμία* is, in the connection which it has here, naturally taken to designate some particular class of the *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαι* mentioned in the previous verse,—where evidently the word has its full original breadth of reference. Knowing, as we do, how gross and glaring were

and are sins of uncleanness among the heathen, and how constantly these are pointed to in N. T. wherever there is any reference to the moral working of heathenism, a reader at once recognises a strong likelihood that this class of lusts is mainly intended here in *ἐπιθυμίαις*; and the fact that the word immediately follows *ἀσελγείαις*, which, as has been said, has in N. T. use pretty decidedly a special reference to impurity, confirms this view.

Οἰνοφλυγία (the latter component being from *φλύειν*, "swell up, overflow") occurs here only in N. T., seldom in classical writers, and never in the LXX., the cognate verb, however, *οἰνοφλυγεῖν*, being found in Deut. xxi. 20; Isa. lvi. 12. According to more than one ancient definition, the word refers strictly to desire, "an excessive love of wine;" but it is commonly used of actual indulgence in long and deep drinking. "Debauch" is probably the best English representative.—The two words which follow point, judging from their ordinary use, particularly to drinking in company, designating gatherings of which drinking was a main purpose. *Κῶμος* (found also in Rom. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 31, in both places in the plural, and in both associated with *μέθαι*) means "a revel, merry-making," frequently in honour of a god, particularly Bacchus, and ending usually in the party's sallying forth from their banqueting-room to parade the streets and indulge in whatever folly or wickedness suggested itself. *Πότος* (here only in N. T.) was "a drinking-party," like *συμπόσιον*. This word was not in itself one, like *οἰνοφλυγία* and *κῶμος*, implying of necessity folly and excess. It was used of the moderate banquets of good men (*e.g.* Gen. xix. 3; 2 Sam. iii. 20, LXX.); but frequent excess (cf. 1 Sam. xxv. 36) had evidently in the apostle's days given it a bad repute. On *οἰνοφλυγία*, *κῶμος*, and *πότος*, see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 61.

In using the plural *εἰδωλολατρίαις*, the apostle probably intends reference both to the worshipping of many gods, and to the many forms in which devotion to the idols was shown. *Ἀθέμιτος* (found elsewhere in N. T. only in Acts x. 28,

Peter's words) is "unlawful,"—strictly, however, in the sense of being opposed to law as laid down by instinctive convictions with respect to what is right (*fas*), rather than to law as set forth in a statute: thus, for example, Philo, in opposing a certain doctrine, says that, granting it, ὁ Θεὸς φθαρτὸς ἔσται, —ὅπερ οὐδὲ θέμις (*i.e.* ὅπερ ἀθέμιτον) νοῆσαι (*Leg. Alleg.* ii. Mang. p. 67). In the connection in which the word appears in the present passage, the apostle seems to imply that the thought set forth in the epithet might and should have suggested itself to his readers whilst still heathen. His reference, therefore, would appear to be to that law written on the heart, and legible to all men unless wilfully blinded (Rom. i. 19–23), which forbids the rendering of worship to any but the living God. It is obvious that in the place which this adjective holds here, in a passage of intensely earnest pleading, it has far greater strength of meaning than where it occurs in Acts. To represent the precise thought by a single English word is perhaps impossible. "Abominable," of both A. and R. E. V. (after Tyndale), answers in a general way to the probable meaning, but not quite to the form of the thought. "Nefarious" again suits perfectly in this latter respect; but its connotation, as commonly used, hardly accords with the requirements of the present connection.

On the catalogue of sinful practices here given, cf. Rom. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 19–21, and particularly Rom. i. 18–32, where the direct connection between departure from the worship of the true God and immorality is exhibited with peculiar clearness and impressiveness. Peter's words in this passage do not, of course, imply that all his readers had been guilty of that grossness of iniquity which he has sketched. As regards the extreme of profligacy, probably what had been the case was simply as Paul states it to the Corinthians (1 Cor. vi. 11), "And such were some of you." There were, doubtless, everywhere among the heathen persons whom thoughtfulness, and instinctive purity and delicacy of feeling, restrained from many of the debasing practices seen around

them. But everything which we gather from the literature of Greece and Rome, as well as from the references made to the subject in N. T., leads us to think that a deplorably large proportion of the people, cultivated and uncultivated alike, lived to some extent in vice, and that in large measure conscience had become torpid.

Of several passages of this Epistle which go to show that those to whom it was addressed were mainly Gentiles, the present gives the most decided testimony to that effect. The whole list of vices suits a heathen population far more than it does a Jewish, in so far as we know anything of the sins to which respectively Gentiles and Jews specially tended; and the reference to "idolatries" cannot, without the strongest forcing, be made to point to Jews. Compare Introd. § II.

Ver. 4. There is brought out expressly here what, as has been seen, is implied in the preceding verses, when viewed in their relation to the context,—namely, that to those whom the apostle addresses there are for choice only alternatives,—either living in frivolity and sin, at which Christian enlightenment revolts, or acceptance of dislike — which in certain circumstances may lead to active persecution — from the world. The world wonders at the Christian's abstinence from modes of life in which it delights; and with the wonderment is conjoined irritation, because through the more or less distinct teaching of conscience (Rom. ii. 15), even when conscience has grown to a considerable extent blind and dull, the lives of Christians are felt to be a reproof and reproach to sin.

Generally in N. T. the verb ξενίζειν has, as in the old classical Greek, the sense of "to entertain a stranger, lodge him" (*e.g.* Acts x. 23; Heb. xiii. 2). Here, as not unfrequently in the later Greek writers, Polybius, Josephus, and others, it means "to give a sense of strangeness, to surprise" (Germ. *befremden*): so also in the 12th verse of this chapter, and (active voice) in Acts xvii. 20. The exhibition of the object causing amazement by ἐν (ἐν ᾧ meaning "at which")

is on the analogy of such combinations as *ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε* (i. 6), *δοξαζέτω Θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* (iv. 16),—on which see notes: cf. also (according to what appears to be the most probable connection of the words in that passage) *θαυμάζειν ἐν*, Luke i. 21. With respect to the antecedent of *ᾧ*, there is a little uncertainty. The simplest view seems to be that what was immediately before the apostle's mind was the thought which he has made specially prominent in the preceding verse (see note there on the use of the perfect participle *πεπορευμένους*),—that for Christians the life of sin is now done with, a thing of the past; or (this being practically the same) that idea of "*regarding* the past time as having been sufficient," etc., which his whole tone assumes as certainly to be ascribed to every one of the believers. "At this"—the fact that their living in vice is ended through the new faith which they have accepted—the heathen around them "are surprised." Then the clause in the genitive absolute attaches itself as an epexegesis of the manifestly somewhat ambiguous *ᾧ*,—"since you run not with them," etc. Some good expositors (as Hofmann, Huther, Salmond) regard the most obvious antecedent as that which is intended, namely, "your having lived like the others,"—the precise source of the wonderment being then explained, by the gen. abs. clause, to be the discordance between the past and the present. But this does not appear natural. Had the relative expression been "with respect to which matter" (*περί* or some similar preposition being employed), this construction would have been probable enough; but *ἐν* exhibits the *basis* of the wonderment, and—even supposing the thought of *μὴ συντρεχόντων κτλ.* already rising before him—one can hardly imagine that, however transitionally, the apostle's thought took the form, "The heathen wonder at your having lived as they did."

On the joining of a gen. abs. to *ξενίζονται*, cf. a closely parallel case with *ἐχάρην*, 3 John 3.—The particle *μή* here has very distinctly its proper subjective force, the fact of "your not running with them" being represented as before

the minds of the heathen and occasioning their surprise.—On the eagerness expressed by *συντρεχόντων*, Prof. John Brown aptly cites the vivid description given by Ovid (*Met.* iii. 528, foll.) of the hurry and frantic excitement seen at the festivals of Bacchus.—On *ἀσωτία*, cf. Eph. v. 18; Tit. i. 6,—also Luke xv. 13 (the adverb *ἀσώτως*), and Prov. vii. 11, LXX. (the adjective *ἄσωτος*). The best English representative seems to be "profligacy." *Ἄσωτος* is plainly, according to the etymology of the word, one so given up to evil courses that men think of him as *σώζεσθαι μὴ δυνάμενος*,—"past redemption," as we say. It is found frequently with special application to pecuniary extravagance, but in the place before us has plainly its widest reference. On this word, cf. Trench, *Syn. N. T.*, § 16.

What is the exact force of *ἀνάχυσις* here is not clear. The word is not a very common one, and is variously used. It occurs with its primary force as a verbal substantive, "outpouring;" thus Philo (*Mund. Opif.*, Mang. p. 13) speaks of the sun extinguishing the light of stars *τῇ τοῦ φέγγους ἀναχύσει*. Again Strabo (iii. A. 206) says, *λέγονται δὲ ἀναχύσεις αἱ πληρούμεναι τῇ θαλάττῃ κοιλάδες ἐν ταῖς πλημμυρίσι καὶ ποταμῶν δίκην ἀνάπλους εἰς τὴν μεσόγαιαν ἔχουσαι*,—that is, inlets or estuaries. The lexicographers Hesychius and Suidas give also "weakness" (a state of "poured-out-ness" of strength, so to speak) as a meaning. This last sense is not suitable. So understood, the statement would lack vigour; and, moreover, *συντρεχόντων εἰς* distinctly leads us to think of *ἀνάχυσιν* here as having a figurative *local* signification. Some (as Alford) take "slough" or "mire" to be the meaning, because portions of certain inlets of the sea answer somewhat to such terms when the water has receded. The idea is good; but there does not seem to be authority for such a translation. Strabo does not in the least degree lead a reader to suppose that the word in itself gave any suggestion of an offensive residuum. The probable sense here seems to be "effusion, gush, flood." The bitter waters of profligacy are—as an

accursed stream, foul and destructive—sweeping over the lands; and the men of the world, rushing down to its banks to bathe in it, and drink of it, and in the end to be carried away by it to ruin, are astonished and angry that the Christians will not run with them. Something like this appears to be the picture before the apostle's mind; and the few words in which he outlines it for us have a singular energy. "The whole phrase vividly describes the rush of the multitude to do evil—that general working of all uncleanness with greediness, which is the unfailing characteristic of every community in which is no knowledge and no fear of the living God. In the absence of all divine and eternal sanctions, the restraints of conscience and shame oppose but a feeble barrier to the torrent of evil; and that very social nature which was meant for the shelter and encouragement of virtue adds an almost irresistible momentum to the current. Such was eminently the case in that dissolute age" (Lillie).

It can hardly be doubted that, in the connection, *βλασφημοῦντες* indicates calumnious reproaches addressed immediately to the believers, at whose ceasing from complicity with them in vice the heathen were surprised and made angry. They closed their eyes to the conclusiveness of the Christian's justification of his conduct, so magnificently stated by Clement of Alexandria (*Pædag.* iii. 12), when, after quoting from Peter the verse preceding the present, he says, *Ὅρον ἔχομεν τὸν σταυρὸν τοῦ Κυρίου· ᾧ περισταυρούμεθα καὶ περιθριγκούμεθα τῶν προτέρων ἁμαρτιῶν.* Because the Christians refused to join in idolatrous services, and in dissipation and debauchery, they were charged with being godless, and with gloomy misanthropy, moroseness even to *odium generis humani* (Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 44). At the same time, whilst this is no doubt the immediate reference of *βλασφημοῦντες*, the predominance in N. T. of that special force which this verb and its cognates obtained among the Jews, as designating language dishonouring to God, makes it reasonable to regard this particular thought as having, in

all likelihood, been in the minds of the sacred writers when they speak of revilings directed against Christians for Christian modes of acting by the name of "blasphemies." The irritation of the heathen, as has been seen, was due undoubtedly to a vague sense that in the pure lives of Christians there was given from heaven a merited reproof for their own vicious lives. Implicitly, therefore, in reviling Christians, they reviled God. The best rendering is perhaps "blasphemously reviling you." This thought of insult offered to God leads with special impressiveness to the statement which immediately follows regarding the Divine Judgement.

Ver. 5. The solemn statement made here is in the direct line of the apostle's course of thought. His readers were perplexed in spirit (see particularly ver. 12) by the troubles to which they were exposed. Under the government of a God almighty and infinitely gracious, they, His children, were treated by bad men with derision and cruelty,—and no outward proof came to them of His interest in them or His displeasure with their enemies. God's people were crushed, and His foes were triumphing. "Nevertheless," says the apostle, "your Father cares for you; and whilst for wise purposes, which you will understand better afterwards, He permits these things now, the great Assize is near, at which your enemies will have to give account of all their works of ungodliness, and of all the hard things which they have spoken against Him (Jude 15). The Lord Jesus, who is Himself reviled and persecuted when His brethren are (Acts ix. 4), will be the Judge, and your Vindicator." That this last thought was before the apostle's mind — the thought not merely in a general way of Divine Judgement (as i. 17), but specifically of the Lord Jesus as the Judge—can scarcely be questioned when we remember his words in the house of Cornelius (Acts x. 42), in which he exhibits it as being a main subject of that preaching and testimony for which the apostles were commissioned, *ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ὡρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν*. The close resemblance

in these words to the language of our present passage shows that in both the object of thought was precisely the same; and by what had been said a sentence or two before (iii. 22), with respect to the exaltation of Christ, the minds of the apostle's readers were prepared to apprehend at once his reference here to the Lord's glory as Judge.

The combination λόγον ἀποδιδόναι is found with the same application as here in Matt. xii. 36; Heb. xiii. 17; Rom. xiv. 12 (the reading in this last place, however, being doubtful between the compound and the simple verb), and with minor references in Luke xvi. 2; Acts xix. 40.—On ἑτοίμως ἔχειν, cf. Acts xxi. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 14,—also 2 Cor. x. 6. On ἑτοίμως in its present connection, cf. i. 5, with note. The next grand manifest divine intervention in the affairs of this world will be the appearance of the Lord to judgement; and to faith, which measures time by the standards of eternity, this great event is always near: cf. vv. 7, 17, with notes. Ἑτοίμως ἔχοντι being in the present place joined with the *aorist* infinitive, the decisiveness of the judgement (once for all) is with much energy set forth by the combination, as well as the nearness.—On κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, cf. (besides Acts x. 42, cited above) 2 Tim. iv. 1. It cannot reasonably be doubted that the force of the expression in these three places is the same, and that in it the words "living and dead" are to be taken in their ordinary acceptation,—the object of the sacred writer being to set forth the absolute universality of the judgement of men by the Lord Jesus, those who shall be alive on the earth at His coming, and those who shall previously have died, being all alike summoned to His tribunal. The interpretation "spiritually alive" and "spiritually dead,"—believers and unbelievers,—which, in view of a particular mode of explaining the difficult verse that follows, some scholars have in our passage attached to the words, is clearly untenable.

Ver. 6. This verse is obscure,—judged, indeed, by many scholars to be as hard of interpretation as any statement found

in Scripture ("certainly among the most intricate passages in the whole book of God," Brown), by some absolutely given up as a *locus desperatus* ("Hunc locum non intelligo, ideoque ad verbum transtuli," Castalio). There is a measure of ambiguity in some of the words, taken separately, or as here associated; and the relation of the verse to the context is not obvious. Considering the variety of reference which is possible for γάρ, it seems best, before trying to determine precisely the connection of the passage with what precedes, to endeavour, aided by the general indications which are given by the drift of the whole paragraph, to ascertain what the probable meaning of the verse is.

Νεκροῖς has been regarded as used here of spiritual death, the sense of the verse being either "To this intent the gospel was preached to men dead in trespasses and sins, that through its working they might have the body of sin destroyed, the flesh with its lusts being mortified (which, in the judgement of the unregenerate — κατὰ ἀνθρώπους, — is no better than death), and might in the spirit have that holiness and happiness which, in the sight of God, constitute true life,"—or "To this intent," etc., "that, though persecuted as to their external circumstances by men (κατὰ ἀνθρώπους), they might, through the gracious working of God, enjoy true life in spirit." In both of these forms of exegesis there are thoughts which could scarcely be brought out of the words of the passage without force. But, whatever be made of the details, the taking of νεκροῖς as speaking of spiritual death seems at all events to be untenable. This word cannot naturally be viewed as having a different reference from νεκρούς immediately preceding,—the force of which, as we have seen, appears quite decidedly to be "dead" in the ordinary sense.

But whilst νεκροῖς cannot naturally be understood otherwise than as designating persons who are "dead" in the same *sense* as νεκρούς of ver. 5, it is not necessary to take the reference in the one as being *coextensive* with that of the other. As it stands in the 5th verse, the word undoubtedly

means *all* the dead: that this is also certainly the case with *νεκροῖς* does not follow. A number of interpreters have maintained, indeed, with much decision, that it does follow,—but on insufficient grounds. The anarthrousness of *νεκρούς* (ver. 5), though the word there means *all* the dead, is in accordance with a not unfrequent licence of the language in cases where nouns are grouped by a conjunction: cf. *e.g.* Matt. x. 37, *πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, υἱὸν ἢ θυγατέρα.* In English, also, we say similarly, "The child has lost both father and mother;" whilst, in speaking of one parent only, we should have to say "his father," "his mother" (in Greek, likewise, *τὸν πατέρα, τὴν μητέρα*). That the use of this licence with grouped nouns does not affect the necessity of either of them, if definite, taking the article, when mentioned separately, even if this should be in the same sentence as the group, is shown by another verse in that chapter which has just been referred to (Matt. x. 28), in the case of *ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα.* Similarly, in English, we have no difficulty in saying "able to destroy both soul and body;" and we also, like the sacred writer in his Greek, have to say, "from those who kill *the* body, but cannot kill *the* soul." Thus the absence of the article from *νεκροῖς* (ver. 6), standing separate, shows that the word is employed indefinitely, "to dead men." These may, in fact, be all, or only some; all that the word, as here used, states, is that the persons meant are dead. Wherever in N. T. *νεκροί* occurs without the article, the context shows that the sense is indefinite (*e.g.* Matt. x. 8; Mark xii. 27; Luke vii. 22; Acts xxvi. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 15, 16), except in cases of recognised licence,—that is to say, groups such as have already been spoken of, instances where the word is governed by a preposition, and the combination, seemingly used as a proper name, *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν.*

The use of *εὐηγγελίσθη* appears to be impersonal,—"glad tidings were carried,"—that is, specifically, according to the regular N. T. application of the verb, "the gospel of Christ was made known." No such supplement as *ὁ Χριστός* (Bengel)

is needful, or naturally suggested by what precedes.—On *εἰς τοῦτο ἵνα*, cf. iii. 9; John xviii. 37; Acts ix. 21; Rom. xiv. 9.

The second of those exegeses mentioned above, in which *νεκροῖς* is regarded as referring to the spiritually dead, assumes, it will be observed, that in the double clause introduced by *ἵνα* the stress is on the latter of the two members. It seems plain, on examination of the passage, that the case is so. We have here an instance of that Hellenistic structure,—not unfrequent in N. T. (see note on *διότι*, i. 24), and most strikingly illustrated in Rom. vi. 17,—according to which thoughts are in form co-ordinated, whilst really one is subordinate to the other. Thus here the purpose of God in having the gospel preached was that, through its influence, those who heard it might have life; and the former of the two clauses presents a subordinate antithetical thought, helpful to the effect of the main one,—the meaning really being, "that, whilst (or, although) judged in flesh, they might live in spirit."

Κριθῶσιν is naturally taken to have a reference to *κρῖναι* of the previous verse; and thus a reader's first thought is that, like *κρῖναι*, it speaks of the general Judgement. The adjuncts which are attached to it, however, appear to show that this is not its application. *Σαρκί* scarcely accords with such a reference. It is true that the resurrection of the body will be prior to the general Judgement; but the term "flesh" does not appear to be anywhere used in Scripture to designate the resurrection-body. Job xix. 26 may perhaps be thought of; but the obscurity of the passage, both as regards the meaning of the words and as regards the reference, prevents anything being rested upon it. The particular word *σάρξ*, moreover, it may be remarked, is not used in LXX. in that place. The fact that our Lord speaks of the *σάρξ* of His resurrection-body while He was still on earth (Luke xxiv. 39), cannot with security be held to prove anything with respect to the applicability of this word to the body given to men at the general Resurrection, particularly when the statement made

in 1 Cor. xv. 50 is taken into view. On the other hand, many passages (*e.g.* Phil. i. 22; Heb. v. 7) point in a marked way to the earthly existence as that to which *σάρξ* belongs; and in the paragraph which the verse now before us closes, *σαρκί*, occurring four times besides the present (iii. 18, iv. 1 *bis*, 2), means quite unequivocally the body here on earth. In three of these places, too (iii. 18 expressly, iv. 1 by obvious implication), the same antithesis appears as that distinctly intimated in our passage between suffering "in flesh" and receiving quickening "in spirit." Now as physical suffering on earth is meant in those other places, the presumption that here also the same is intended by *κριθῶσι σαρκί* is so strong, when all the various facts which have just been dealt with are considered, that only evidence of its being impossible to obtain a satisfactory exegesis of the verse on this view of the meaning of the expression would justify departure from it. The fact that *νεκροί* are expressly described as the subjects of the statement, suggests that dying itself is the "being judged in flesh" which is referred to; and when we find that the antithesis is "living in spirit," this is confirmed to conviction. We feel that *κριθῶσι μὲν σαρκὶ, ζῶσι δὲ πνεύματι*, is very closely parallel to the foundation statement of the whole paragraph, *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι* (iii. 18).

It would seem, therefore, so far as at this stage of our examination we are able to determine, that the mention in ver. 5 of our Lord's being "ready to judge the living and the dead" at the Last Day, brought up vividly before the apostle's mind, on some ground, thought of God's judicial dealing in, according to the principles of His moral administration, inflicting physical death (*διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος*, Rom. v. 12). Subjection to this penalty of sin he calls *κρίνεσθαι*. Similarly, in 1 Cor. xi. 30–32, bodily illness and death are spoken of as "judgements;" and, a little later in our Epistle, Peter calls persecution and other outward trials *κρίμα* (iv. 17).

Κατὰ ἀνθρώπους appears in the connection to mean "after the manner of men," "as men are judged,"—that is, "according to the doom which for sin has come on the whole human race;" and correspondingly *κατὰ Θεόν* is "after the manner of God," "as God lives,"—this latter statement being kindred to that other of Peter (2 Ep. i. 4), *ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*. On *κατὰ Θεόν*, cf. v. 2, note. With *κατὰ ἀνθρώπους* cf. Paul's familiar form of expression in the singular, individualizing, *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* (*e.g.* Rom. iii. 5; 1 Cor. iii. 3): in the present place, universality being of the essence of the thought intended, the singular would not have been suitable. Ignatius (*Trall.* § 2) has *κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ζῶντες*, "living as men live:" *κατὰ Θεόν* also occurs a number of times in his writings (*e.g. Magn.* § 1).

If the conclusions which have now been reached with regard to the force of the words and phrases are well based, the natural interpretation of the verse is, "For to this intent" (the position of *εἰς τοῦτο* shows that on the *purpose* the stress of the sentence rests) "was the gospel made known also to persons who are dead, that, whilst judged (subjected to the judgement of death) in flesh, as men are, they might in spirit live as God lives (live a life of holy blessedness, kindred to God's, *κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι*, i. 15)." Two objections are urged to this being accepted as the sense intended by the apostle. *First*, this view of the meaning proceeds on the supposition that *νεκροῖς* speaks of "persons who are *now* dead," but who were alive at the time when "the gospel was preached to them,"—whereas, according to the *prima facie* force of *νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη*, a preaching to men dead at the time of the preaching is described—an evangelizing of dead men. This is no doubt the sense which the mind attaches first to the two words taken by themselves; but there is nothing in the least degree forced, or indeed at all uncommon, in a combination of words like this being used in the other way, the rest of the sentence suggesting the meaning intended by the writer. A sense of the continued oneness of the per-

sonality leads constantly to expressions of this kind. Suppose that a naval officer of distinction happened to be mentioned in conversation, and that an old schoolmaster in the company said, "I taught the admiral navigation,"—not a moment's doubt would be felt by any hearer that the old man spoke of the admiral long before he had become an admiral; nor would there be the least feeling that the mode of speaking was strained or odd. Even the transition into the state of the dead does not interfere with the entire naturalness of this form of expression. When a newly-made widow says of a friend, "I shall always be grateful to him, because he loved —honoured—showed kindness to—the dead," the statement is at once understood to point to kindness shown during *life* to him who is *now* dead. So in Ruth i. 8, "The Lord deal kindly with you, as ye have dealt with the dead (*μετὰ τῶν τεθνηκότων*, LXX.):" similarly also ii. 20. The only difference between such statements and that at present before us is that, in those which have been spoken of, the reference to something done in life to persons who are now dead presents itself at once and inevitably to the mind of the reader or hearer, through the knowledge of the circumstances which is possessed, —whilst in this verse we have but a passing allusion, to the exact force of which we are not immediately guided by the context. But that the apostle's first readers—able, from their perfect acquaintance with those circumstances in their position which specially had induced the apostle to write to them, to see in a moment the purport of the slightest allusion—did not attach to the words before us a reference to experiences *prior* to death as directly as we do to the words of Naomi, or that they had any more consciousness of strain in doing so with these words than we have with hers,—this is manifestly a quite unsupported assumption. The probabilities of the case must be argued out from consideration of the nature of the statement, according to the force of its words and clauses and connection,—the combination *νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη* accommodating itself readily to either of the positions with

respect to time. The question is obviously in kind precisely the same with that as to the reference of *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν* in iii. 19, which was fully discussed.

The *second* difficulty in the way of admitting that meaning of the verse which has been given above is found in the obscurity of the connection of the passage, when thus understood, with what precedes. But when one bears in mind the main drift of the whole paragraph, particularly as shown in summary form in the last clause of iii. 18 and in iv. 1, a natural connection for our verse readily presents itself. The central thought throughout has been that suffering in flesh for righteousness' sake brings life and strength in spirit. Now plainly the present verse, the last of the paragraph, echoes those verses just mentioned, and this in a specially marked way through the emphatic position given to *σαρκί* and *πνεύματι*. We seem, therefore, to be naturally led—obliged indeed—to think of persecuted Christians as the subjects of the apostle's statement here; and, seeing that these are expressly called *νεκροί*, and that "being judged as men are in flesh," which was their pathway to "living as God lives in spirit," appears in the connection undoubtedly to mean death, the natural conclusion seems to be that the persons immediately before the apostle's thoughts were Christians who under persecution had died for the cause of their Lord. On the likelihood that, in the later years of Nero, and from that time onward, there may have been now and again even severe persecutions in different parts of the empire, of which no record has been preserved, see Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, vol. i. pp. 15, 16. The entirely casual way in which we learn—and this not from a Christian but a heathen source—of the severe persecution in Bithynia in A.D. 112, is very suggestive in this direction. That the oppression under which the believers in Asia Minor were suffering at the time of this Epistle had already gone so far as the subjection of some to a violent death—really, whether avowedly or not, for their religion—may quite reasonably be held to be hinted in iv. 1 (see note

there); and the supposition accords well with the statement made in iv. 12. *Πύρωσις* in this last passage is a very strong word, and the persecution indicated by it was not *about* to come, but had already begun (*γινομένῃ*).

Supposing the reference in our verse then to be to Christian martyrs, the connection exhibited by *γάρ* must be not immediately with what is said in ver. 5, but, as very frequently in the case of this conjunction, with an intermediate thought, natural and generally obvious. The apostle has said that the blasphemous calumniators of the Christians shall have to "give account to Him who is ready to judge living and dead." This last expression is universal in its reference, pointing to the judgement both of friends and enemies of Christ, persecutors and persecuted alike. The practical force of the statement is therefore, of course, that in that Day the folly and sin of the persecutors will be publicly made manifest, and the servants of Christ gloriously vindicated. While, with this wide reference, he writes the word *νεκρούς*, the remembrance comes up vividly before him of some of his Christian brethren in Asia Minor who, as he knew, had already been placed in this class of *νεκροί* directly through the cruelty of the heathen. He was aware also, we may suppose, that the thought of these martyrs was with much liveliness before the minds of those to whom he was writing,—and that among them that deep and painful sense of mystery which we know (1 Thess. iv. 13–18) to have existed among some of the early Christians, when they saw around them those who loved the Lord dying before He came again in His glory, was intensified exceedingly by seeing Christ's people die—perhaps amid torments—expressly because they served Christ. In the state of mind in which some at least of Peter's readers evidently were with respect to suffering for Christ's sake generally, such a sight as this they certainly could not but "think strange" (iv. 12) in a very high degree. To this difficulty, then, the apostle adverts,—and that in such a way as to place the copestone on the whole invigorating

teaching of the paragraph, with regard to the "quickening" power of "suffering in flesh" for righteousness' sake. He tells them that, when the persecutor does that which, from his point of view, is his very worst, he is, in truth, but introducing the Christian into a far higher sphere of that spiritual life which he had begun to live here, a life kindred to the life of God. "Your revilers shall give account to Him who is ready to judge living and dead. *Dead*, remember, brethren, as well as living. Your martyred dead, of whom your hearts, I know, are full, will have a triumphant vindication; for this was the very purpose for which the gospel was made known to men also who are dead (as well as to you and me who are still alive),—this,—that, whilst judged, as men are, in flesh, there should be for them nothing further of judgement involving suffering, but that they might live in spirit as God lives." On this view of the connection, the transition from the application of *κρῖναι* in ver. 5 to the general judgement to that made here of *κριθῶσι* to dying, is easy, and has a special tenderness and beauty; and all parts of the verse have their full natural force. While the course of thought certainly seems, as has been said, to lead to the view that *martyrs* are immediately in the apostle's mind, yet obviously the declaration of the verse really gives its full comfort to all who mourn over Christian dead. The apostle's statement is parallel to that of Paul (Rom. viii. 10), *Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην*,—the structure there also, singularly enough, having the same kind of irregularity as here, for clearly the formally co-ordinate clause *τὸ μὲν σῶμα κτλ.* is really subordinate.

If it be objected to that connection of the passage which has now been sketched, that the train of thought assumed to link the 5th verse to the 6th is not altogether *obvious*, a sufficient answer appears to be at hand. The question whether there had been, among those to whom the apostle wrote, some recent deaths by martyrdom, is one with respect

to which, from the imperfect knowledge we have of the history of Asia Minor during that age, nothing more than conjecture is possible. A probability that the case was so seems, as has been said, to present itself from the modes of expression employed in iv. 1, 12. If we suppose that there really had been such deaths, and bear in mind that tenderness of feeling respecting their loss which must have existed for a long time among the surviving brethren, we can hardly doubt that, when the Epistle was read in the various churches, the martyrdoms would be prominently in the thoughts of the people throughout the whole of the present paragraph and much which follows. Thus, at any point, the force of the slightest turn of language naturally bearing on the death of their friends would be perfectly obvious to them,—however it may be at first to us somewhat obscure. Given the supposed circumstances,—and these are probable,—the course of thought connecting the 5th and 6th verses is altogether natural, and the meaning assumed to be yielded by the 6th verse is quite accordant with the force of its words and of their construction, and in entire and beautiful consistency with the whole paragraph which the verse winds up.

By a few of those interpreters who regard the persons spoken of in the verse as having heard the gospel in their lifetime (as Hofmann), the reference of *νεκροί* is supposed to be to *persecutors*, and the apostle's object to be to comfort the suffering Christians with the assurance that in no case will their oppressors escape their merited punishment. "They shall give account to Him who is ready to judge living and dead,—yes, those of them who may be dead when the Lord comes, shall be brought to stern judgement as fully as those who may be alive, for they heard the gospel and rejected it." This view is untenable. The tone of feeling thus supposed to be in the passage is not consistent with the general spirit of N. T. That the delightful sketch, *ἵνα ζῶσι κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι*, should be given merely to serve as a bright background for a dark record of condemnation, is, in the connec-

tion, altogether unnatural. The course of thought throughout the paragraph regarding the efficiency, for quickening in the sphere of spirit, of the bearing of persecution for Christ—a course marked, as by guide-posts, by the occurrence time after time of the antithesis of *σαρκί* and *πνεύματι*—is entirely interrupted by making the reference of this antithesis to be in the present verse to the persecutors. Various serious objections of detail also present themselves on a careful consideration of this exegesis, which are well stated by Wiesinger, —who has given to this position of Hofmann an almost needlessly long and elaborate discussion.

Many expositors make the *prima facie* force of *νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη* a fixed point—*the* fixed point—in their exegesis, —"the gospel was preached to dead men" at the time when they were dead; and endeavour in various ways to make the other parts of the verse, and the connection with ver. 5, square with this. Naturally, this class of exegetes includes most of those who see in iii. 19, 20, an announcement of our Lord's preaching in the regions of the dead. The fact that within the same paragraph, though at a considerable distance from each other, two passages occur which, on a surface view, may be held both to speak of a proclamation of the gospel to the dead, arrests the attention of every student of the Epistle; and the coincidence may not unreasonably be held to establish a measure of likelihood that this really is the meaning in both the passages. Yet the measure of probability thus established is in itself but slight, and has no appreciable counterbalancing weight, when serious difficulties, grammatical and logical, are seen to obstruct the acceptance of this view of the sense in either place. In literature and in life superficial coincidences, as striking or more striking, show themselves every day, which yet, on examination, often prove to be merely casual, with no underlying relation. As regards the meaning of our present passage, the fact is worthy of note that to the *consensus* among those expositors who see a preaching to the dead in iii. 19, in seeing the same here also, one exception—out of several—

is Bengel, a commentator ranking certainly among the very foremost, if not himself absolutely the foremost, for learning, breadth of judgement, and spiritual insight. The tendency must have been strong with him, since he had been led to interpret iii. 19 of a visit to Hades, to recognise the same here. But he saw clearly that the natural reference of *κριθῶσι σαρκί*, in the connection which it has in this sentence, is to dying,—and that this cannot reasonably be viewed as *prior* to *εὐηγγελίσθη*, of which it is by *ἵνα* expressly indicated to be, so far as regards the form of the sentence, a part of the *purpose:* "ex quo ipso" (that is, the clause *ἵνα κριθῶσι σαρκί*) "etiam patet evangelii prædicationem innui morte illa priorem, non posteriorem."

By those who interpret *εὐηγγελίσθη* of a preaching in the regions of the dead, the connection of vv. 5, 6, is thought to be as follows:—"Our Lord is ready to judge the dead,—and with reason, for even they have not been without opportunity of receiving His gospel." This, which is Alford's statement, adequately represents the general position of those who hold this exegesis. Now, in this supposed connection itself there lie difficulties. *In the first place,* if vv. 5 and 6 stand related to each other in this way, the course of thought appears singular. There can be no doubt that, springing as it does out of mention in the 4th verse of the persecuting spirit of the heathen in Asia Minor (*βλασφημοῦντες*), the statement made in the 5th verse has in it very prominently a solemn sternness. Now, the sequence is, to say the least, peculiar: "Your persecutors shall render account to Him who is ready to judge living and dead,—to judge the dead also, I say, for to this intent the gospel has been preached to the dead, that they may enjoy eternal life" (this last being undoubtedly the *main* thought in the clause introduced by *ἵνα*). *Secondly,* the assumption involved in this mode of connection, that at the great day of final account the judgement will, with respect to every member of the human race, be determined by his having accepted or refused Jesus Christ as made known in

the gospel, does not seem to be based on Scripture,—which simply affirms that judgement will be according to the varied measures of light granted to men, and that the Judge of all the earth will do right (Luke xii. 47, 48; Rom. i. 18–20, ii. 9–16, etc.). *Thirdly*, supposing it were admitted that the reason alleged to be given in ver. 6 for the statement made in ver. 5 with respect to the judgement of the dead is scriptural, and is expressed in a natural way, still it is hard to see the relevancy in this place of such a justification of Christ's judging the dead. Nothing in the paragraph, or indeed anywhere in N. T., suggests in the remotest way that difficulties on this head perplexed or distressed the early Christians anywhere; and certainly, to state the case in the mildest way, an explanation of the kind supposed seems to have no special suitableness in the present connection. As Professor Salmond puts the matter excellently, "Peter is not dealing with any such question as how it shall stand with those who have not heard the gospel in this world, but with a plain case where the gospel is known,—the case where Christians are slandered by their heathen neighbours for their fidelity to the gospel. How should the mention of a gospel preached to the dead in the under-world bear upon the position of living Christians who are misrepresented by living detractors in the upper world? What encouragement to patient endurance of heathen slander should Christians find in the information that their heathen persecutors are assured of a new period of favour in the other world? Or how should the mention of Christ's graciousness towards the unrighteous dead incite the righteous living to a persevering separation from heathen impurity?"

The exegesis of those who regard the verse as speaking of a preaching of the gospel among the dead takes various forms. By most of these scholars *κριθῶσι σαρκί* is—rightly, as we have seen reason to believe—judged to refer to physical death; and those intended by *νεκροῖς* are either certain sections of the dead (as, the antediluvian sinners mentioned

in the previous chapter,—so de Wette; or, more widely, those who died before the coming of Christ,—so some of the older interpreters), or the dead generally (so Wiesinger, Huther, and others). Those difficulties in the way of logical connection which have been indicated above affect the exegesis in any of these forms. All of them are confronted, too, with a most serious grammatical objection in the twist which they give to ἵνα κριθῶσι, making these words speak of a death which is *past*. While it is true, as has already been said, that the former of the two members of the clause introduced by ἵνα is in sense subordinate, the stress of thought being on ζῶσι, yet in form it is clearly a co-ordinate part of the statement of the aim intended in εὐηγγελίσθη. Now it seems impossible that in the mind of any logical thinker—under whatever Hebraizing influences—the clause could present itself as one of purpose relatively to εὐηγγελίσθη, if the κριθῆναι had taken place *before* the εὐαγγελισθῆναι, and was at the time present to the consciousness of the writer as having been prior. A number of commentators pass this point by with some slight observation to the effect that the clause is tantamount to one in which ἵνα governed ζῶσι only, the intervening thought being represented by a participle. Now, however true this is in fact, it does not really touch the difficulty. Wiesinger, always thorough and candid, manifestly—and reasonably—finds it hard in the utmost degree to satisfy himself that κριθῶσι can mean what his exposition makes it mean, "be in the state of having been judged," or, "of being judged" (the state of death being deemed a continuation of the "judging in flesh" begun at death). He appeals to but one passage, 1 John iii. 23, as analogous; and gains nothing thereby, because, in the first place, it is not by any means certain that the aorist there is the true reading,—and, secondly, even if it is, the natural reference of πιστεύσωμεν to a decisive *act* of faith is in every way suitable, "the decisive act of faith being treated as the foundation of the abiding work of love" (Westcott, *in loc.*). In every case in N. T. in which

ἵνα is construed with an aorist and a present, the distinction is quite obviously the regular one between an act and a state, —as here between dying and living; cf. John ix. 39, x. 38. One case of a conceivably retrospective aorist subjunctive is to be found in John xii. 7 (true reading); but the construction is uncertain, the view that the force of the tense is retrospective not being the most probable,—and, in any case, in the way in which a verb is used after ἀφιέναι ἵνα there lies no true analogy to the passage before us, where ἵνα plainly has in purity its regular sense of purpose.

Where, as with the majority of the recent advocates of the exegesis under discussion, the word νεκροῖς is supposed to indicate *all* the dead, there is, besides the difficulty found in ἵνα κριθῶσι, another, almost equally serious, connected with εὐηγγελίσθη. The only natural view of the force of this verb here is as an ordinary narrative aorist, there being nothing whatever in the structure or relations of the sentence to suggest the gnomic force (as i. 24), or any other kindred use of this tense. Now obviously the historic statement εὐηγγελίσθη—whilst sufficient, if the supposed preaching of the Lord to the antediluvian sinners is thought of as referred to here, or some similar proclamation of truth to the dead of the pre-Christian ages generally—is an inadequate form of expression if all who die before the Lord's Advent to Judgement be deemed to be pointed to.

A few interpreters (Plumptre, Mason, and one or two more) understand κριθῶσι σαρκί not of death, but of some judicial action of God at the time of resurrection and general judgement. All these scholars seem to regard νεκροῖς as designating the dead generally. Thus their exegesis lies under the objection just stated with respect to the force of εὐηγγελίσθη; and whilst they escape that connected with the time of κριθῶσι, they are confronted with equal difficulties of another kind, in the peculiar application of σαρκί, and in the marked deviation which they make from the contextual reference of the antithesis between σαρκί and πνεύματι.

Mason maintains, though somewhat hesitatingly, that the verse means that wicked men who in Hades believe in Christ, through the supposed preaching to them there, shall not have resurrection of the body (the withholding of this constituting their being "judged in flesh"), but in some sense shall, "as God sees it" (*κατὰ Θεόν*), live in spirit. Dean Plumptre's language does not give a reader the idea that he holds exactly the same view as Mr. Mason, but what he does hold it is not easy to determine with precision. "The dead had the gospel preached to them, that they might be judged by a judgement, which was remedial as well as penal, in that lower sensuous nature in which they had sinned,"—and "live, in the highest sense of life, in that element of their nature which was capable of knowing God, and therefore of eternal life." "Such," he observes, "seems the simple, natural interpretation of the words;" and he goes on to remark on the influence of "dogmatic prepossessions" in swaying men from it (*Cambridge Bible for Schools, in loc.*). In another book, *The Spirits in Prison*, published in 1884, five years later than that just quoted, Dr. Plumptre (p. 119) states as the sense of our verse, "They, too" ("the dead generally"), "were to have the opportunity of being conformed to the likeness of Christ, dying as He died, and thus bearing, as He bore, the penalty of sin, that so they might be sharers in His life." The meaning of this may possibly be the same as that of the other statement.

The exegesis of this verse is certainly not obvious or easy; but, on a retrospect of the whole discussion, the direction in which probability points with regard to the apostle's meaning appears to be marked with sufficient distinctness. On the one side, we have as difficulties the facts that there must be attached to *νεκροῖς* a reference as respects time, different from that which *prima facie* suggests itself,—and that the connection between vv. 5 and 6 is based on a view with regard to the severity of the persecution under which the Asiatic Christians were suffering at the time of the letter, that rests to some

extent on conjecture. The proposed reference of *νεκροῖς*, however, though not the first which occurs, is in itself perfectly natural, and accords with frequent use; and the assumed severity of the persecution — its having already brought some believers to a violent death—has in it nothing which is at all improbable, and seems, indeed, to be directly pointed to by various modes of expression in the Epistle. Conceding these two positions, the meaning obtained is entirely accordant with the sense of the words and with their construction, — is in itself beautiful, and eminently fitted to comfort the distressed Christians to whom the letter was written,—and is in the direct line of the current of thought traceable throughout the whole paragraph which the verse closes. This last point is one of very special moment, seeing that the reappearance here of that antithesis which has come in again and again between "suffering in flesh" and "life in spirit" seems with much emphasis to indicate that the verse is *in* the main current, not in a mere eddy.

On the other side, there are most serious grammatical difficulties, connected both with *εὐηγγελίσθη* and with *κριθῶσι σαρκί*; and, on any form of the exegesis, a considerable measure of unnaturalness presents itself in the relation of the verse to that which precedes, and seemingly an utter want of relevancy to the general drift of the paragraph.

Vv. 7–11. *On the duties of Christians as associated in congregations.*

In the practical part of his letter the apostle has, up to this point, been giving advices bearing on difficulties and sufferings to which his readers, in the various positions they occupied, were exposed in carrying on the general work of life. He proceeds now to speak specially of the duties incumbent on them as associated in congregations, the thought

of trouble and anxiety to the Church from persecution being also still prominently before his mind.

Ver. 7. The words *πάντων τὸ τέλος* cannot be naturally taken to mean anything else than the close of the probationary history of our earth through the Second Coming of Christ, His coming to raise the dead and judge the world. By some interpreters the reference has been supposed to be to the destruction of Jerusalem. Now, beyond question, that awful catastrophe could not fail to make a very deep impression on the minds of Christians everywhere throughout the world, and was one in which they would certainly and justly recognise a "coming of the Son of Man" for judgement. But that to Christians living at a great distance from Jerusalem, and many of them of Gentile birth, the overthrow of the Jewish capital and commonwealth would be spoken of by the apostle under such a name as "the end of all things," is a wholly unnatural thought, and could scarcely have been entertained by any, but for the difficulty lying in the word *ἤγγικεν*, —on which see below.—The emphatic position of *πάντων* suggests an antithesis with some *partial* "end" mentioned before. This must lie in *νεκροῖς* and *κριθῶσι σαρκί* of ver. 6. Some interpreters, accordingly, take *πάντων* as masculine. This is striking; but it may be questioned whether such an expression as "the end of all men" has likelihood in N. T. Where "the end" of men is spoken of (ver. 17, below; 2 Cor. xi. 15; Phil. iii. 19), the reference is always to the *wicked*. The occurrence of language which would distinctly say that the day of the Saviour's appearing is to be, in any sense, "the end" of those who, through faith in Him, have passed into "the life eternal," seems improbable. Neither does there appear to be any need for such formal exactness of contrast. "The end of all things," which is undoubtedly the rendering of the words, taken by themselves, that rises first to the mind, is, from its generality—"the end of the present constitution of things"—not liable to objection, and with abundant pointedness presents to every conscience this thought, "the end for

all of the time of probation, the presence for all of the Judge." The transition from the 6th verse to this is natural and easy: "But, passing from the thought of the death of this friend and of that, and of the issues in the unseen world to them, let us bear in mind and be habitually influenced by the contemplation of that transcendent event which is so momentous to every one of us, and which is *near*."

The perfect ἤγγικεν (as *e.g.* Rom. xiii. 12; Jas. v. 8) is practically = ἐγγύς ἐστιν (Mark xiii. 29; Phil. iv. 5), differing from it only by intimating that there has been previous approach. Now, how can this statement of Peter, the similar declarations of the other apostles (as in the passages of Philippians and James, just referred to), and the promise of our Lord Himself, "Behold, I come quickly" (Rev. iii. 11, xxii. 7, 12, 20), be reconciled with the facts of history? Eighteen centuries have passed away, and "the sign of the Son of Man" has not yet appeared in the sky. How then could the Lord's Second Advent and "the end of all things" be in those old days predicted as at that time near? The answer—one which the Christian, in the measure of the liveliness and intelligence of his faith, sees and feels to be satisfactory—seems clearly to be that the matter is here set before us as it is viewed from heaven. The force of such words as "near" and "distant" is very variable, according to the standard applied. To the young man of twenty a possible half-century of coming life seems something vast. To the old man, who looks back over his seventy or eighty years as on a tale which has been told, the tale seems to have been a very short one; and the aged Christian's pleading with the youth would be that, even if he knew certainly that he should see eighty years, yet he would act wisely in always counting the end as *near*. In the case before us the standard of eternity is applied, because on those who know themselves immortal the consciousness that "the end of all things" is near, is pre-eminently fitted to exert an influence leading them habitually to live as becomes immortality. Alike for stimulus

and for cheer, God would have us to be ever in an attitude of waiting for the coming of the Lord. When the faith of the Church is lively, and her love glowing, she does thus wait, looking with eager, longing anticipation for "that blessed hope" as near of fulfilment. As under the clear sky of the east a range of lofty mountains seems through many days' journey almost at hand, so in the pellucid atmosphere of faith the great towering event of the future, dwarfing all else, appears close above us. See the statement of the principle of the reckoning in 2 Pet. iii. 8, 9; and compare Paul's estimate of the Christian's affliction—affliction spread perhaps over threescore years and ten—as "but for a moment," because the standard by which he computed was the "eternal" duration of the "weight of glory" that was to follow (2 Cor. iv. 17).

Whether the apostles themselves, pondering the data which God had made known to them, thought it likely that "the end of all things" would come during their own generation, is a question to which we are not in a position to give an answer. Considering how wide, according to what the Lord had told them, the diffusion of the gospel throughout the world was to be,—and also the fact that they themselves received communications from the Spirit with regard to events which appearances could not lead them to look upon as probably of immediate or very speedy occurrence, such as the general conversion of the Jews (Rom. xi.),—it may reasonably be doubted whether they did entertain such an opinion. What was their private anticipation, however, whilst an interesting question, is not one of theological importance; whereas it is of vast moment to see clearly that their *teaching* is in no respect inconsistent with truth. Now they have nowhere said anything beyond what the Apostle John in the Apocalypse gives us again and again as the express utterance of the Lord Jesus Himself in His glory, "Behold, I come quickly."

An impressive argument for the divine origin of Scripture is afforded by the fact that, even in connection with those elements of its teaching which, to mere human view, might

seem likely to produce fanatical excitement, the ethical advices given are always calm and well ordered,—and that in the history of the Church, wherever belief on such points has been in accordance with Scripture, the ethical influence of the belief has been proved to be healthful, calming and strengthening. The mention of the Second Coming of Christ as near is associated, as a rule, with references to the duty and the reasonableness of self-control, — of patience under trouble (Jas. v. 7–9), of gentleness towards opponents, and restfulness of heart in God (Phil. iv. 5–7), of watchfulness, purity, unworldliness and love (Rom. xiii. 11–14; 1 Thess. v. 1–8). In the passage before us, similarly,—the great introductory statement being intended, no doubt, to bear on the whole section,—the legitimate moral effect of a remembrance that "the end of all things is near" is represented to be the stirring up of the soul to prayerfulness, sobriety of feeling, and active Christian love.

The apostle speaks first of prayer, and of the state of the heart which meetens it for prayer. Communion with God in prayer is the centre and spring of spiritual life, and hence plainly whatever gives peculiar vividness to the thought of God, and of our relations to Him, has as its primary result an intensifying of the Christian's interest in prayer.—In using the plural προσευχάς the apostle is evidently thinking of different acts of prayer, or different classes of prayers. In similar counsels elsewhere in N. T. the singular is found, "Give yourselves to prayer," "Continue in prayer" (τῇ προσευχῇ, Rom. xii. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 5; Col. iv. 2),—which is obviously the natural form when the duty in general is thought of. But as what follows in this section of the Epistle shows that duties connected specially with church life are in the apostle's mind, it seems likely that this specialty of reference is to be recognised also in the use here of the plural,—pointing to the duty of prayer as discharged under various circumstances, to social prayer as well as private. The form suggests this, and thus leads into the more explicit

mention of church duties. — For earnestness and power in prayer, purity of soul is needful. To the obstruction caused by sin in the way of true prayer, the apostle has already adverted (iii. 7). In the verse now before us he calls on his readers to cultivate a pure and elevated spirit, to the intent that their prayers may be gladsome and efficacious. In the N. T., as by classical writers, *σωφρονεῖν* is used both in its primary sense as opposed to insanity, "to be of sound mind" (*e.g.* Luke viii. 35), and (here and in Tit. ii. 6) in its secondary, as opposed to the moral madness of lavish indulgence in any kind of sensuality,—"to maintain habitual self-government, holding all the passions under restraint;" cf. Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 20. Philo (*Mund. Opif.*, Mang. p. 17) makes *σωφροσύνη* the opposite of *ἀκολασία*. As to *νήφειν*, cf. i. 13, note. In their secondary use, as here, *σωφρονεῖν* and *νήφειν* are so very nearly synonymous that to draw a distinction is difficult. We are perhaps justified, however, in throwing ourselves back on the etymology and primary force of *σωφρονεῖν*, regarding it therefore as pointing to clear and accurate *views* with regard to living above the power of sensuality and worldliness, "to be (morally) sound-minded;" whilst *νήφειν* refers rather to *feelings and conduct* accordant with this soundness of mind, purity and unworldliness of spirit and life. For the rendering of *νήφειν* by "watch," which here and in 2 Tim. iv. 5 the translators of the A. E. V. have substituted for "be sober" (the translation given by them in the other places where the word occurs), there appears to be no adequate authority; and therefore the Revisers have in these passages,—as also with the adjective *νηφάλιος* in 1 Tim. iii. 2, rendered in the A. V. "vigilant,"—rightly altered the translation.

When the clause before us, then, stands thus, "Be sound-minded, therefore, and be sober, in order to prayers," there seems to be no reason why both the verbs should not be regarded as connected with *εἰς προσευχάς*; and, indeed, they seem to be somewhat unnaturally severed from each other, if,

as in A. V., the connection be made only with the second verb. Tyndale joins the last words with both verbs,—"Be ye therefore discrete and sober, that ye maye be apte to prayers." The R. V. by its punctuation parts the verbs,—"Be ye therefore of sound mind, and be sober unto prayer."—Here, as always, the aorist imperative gives a quick decisive command; and where, as here, this form is employed in verbs descriptive of a state of mind or of life which is to be habitually maintained, it seems to point, taken strictly, to the first vigorous effort to attain the state; cf. *e.g.* Jas. v. 7, μακροθυμήσατε.—Polycarp (§ 7) has an evident reference to the last clause of this verse, νήφοντες πρὸς τὰς εὐχάς.

Ver. 8. In this verse and those which follow throughout the section the apostle attaches his precepts to the first, σωφρονήσατε καὶ νήψατε, by a series of participles, or of adjectives with ὄντες understood,—a kind of construction which he somewhat specially favours; cf. ii. 13–iii. 9, iii. 15, 16. In the present case, as to some extent in the former of the two passages just referred to, he does not seem to intend the participles to be taken as strictly subordinate in thought to the expressed imperative with which the series of injunctions opens, but rather to the general appeal of which that imperative is a special form, "Seek to be in heart and life what those who look for the end of all things as near may reasonably be expected to desire to be."—The first of the participial clauses contains an exhortation to fervour of mutual love, which is represented as of paramount importance (πρὸ πάντων; cf. Jas. v. 12). This, of course, does not at all imply that other duties—such as those which have been mentioned in the previous verse—might safely be neglected, but simply draws special attention to the transcendent importance of this grace,—as constituting, indeed, the atmosphere in which all the other graces bloom their fairest and bear their richest fruits (cf. 1 Thess. iii. 12, 13). In urging the cultivation of brotherly love all the apostles, following the example of their Master, take great delight. Peter has touched on this

subject again and again (i. 22, ii. 17, iii. 8). In the present place his mode of expression (*τήν*) assumes the existence of love in some measure among his readers, as belonging indeed to the essence of spiritual religion; and his injunction is to have the love "fervent, intense."—The use, as here and in ver. 10, of the reflexive pronoun for the reciprocal *ἀλλήλων*, "one another," is common in N. T., as in classical writers; cf. Jelf, § 654. 3.—The adjective *ἐκτενῆ*, standing outside of the combination with the article, is predicative: on the construction, cf. ii. 12, *τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ἔχοντες καλήν*; and on *ἐκτενῆ*, cf. i. 22, *ἐκτενῶς*.

With respect to the exact reference of the statement made in the second clause of the verse there is some doubt. The expression *καλύπτειν πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν* occurs also in Jas. v. 20, and there it is spoken of a zealous Christian who, leading a sinner to repentance, thus "covers a multitude of sins" by bringing the man within the sphere of God's covenant mercy, which hides his sins. This kind of "covering" is that spoken of in Ps. xxxii. 1 (a passage which was possibly in James's mind when using the word in this particular way), *μακάριοι ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι* (LXX.). But though these words may have been floating before James's memory, the origin of the expression appears with very great likelihood—especially when we look at it as it stands in the verse before us, with *ἀγάπη* as the subject—to be Prov. x. 12, thus given in A. E. V., "Hatred stirreth up strifes, but love covereth all sins (transgressions, R. V.)." The LXX. wanders in the second clause quite away from the true meaning, having *πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύψει φιλία.* Peter's words are not a literal rendering of the clause in Proverbs, *πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν* representing כָּל־פְּשָׁעִים only loosely; still the resemblance seems much too close to be merely casual. How the particular form of words arose which is found in James and Peter, cannot be determined. Possibly the passage stood so in some Greek version used by the apostles: on the likelihood that even before the time of our Lord there were,

besides the LXX., other Greek versions of at least certain books of O. T., cf. Salmon, *Introd. N. T.*, 2nd ed., Lecture 26. The sense of the clause as it occurs in Proverbs is shown quite clearly by the antithesis with the first part of the verse to be that love, as far as is possible, hides the offences of others. As Luther has it (cited by Wiesinger), "Gleichwie Gott mit seiner Liebe meine Sünde decket wenn ich glaube, so soll ich meines Nächsten Sünde auch decken."

As the words occur in Peter, there is nothing at all so decisive in the context with regard to their precise force as either in Proverbs or in James; and expositors have been considerably divided in opinion respecting it. (1) The reference may be to the sins of the man himself who cherishes the love: "Love covers (secures the covering by God of) a multitude of sins, through its proving the soul to have true fruit-bearing faith" (cf. Matt. vi. 14). As thus stated, this view of the meaning has been held by many Protestant interpreters; whilst with Roman Catholics — bringing in, however, the thought of personal desert in the love manifested —it has been the usual one. (2) Again, the meaning may be, somewhat as in James, to this effect, "Love is the grand impelling power to effort for the edification of the Church and the extension of the knowledge of the gospel, and thus brings men under the covering mercy of God." To this view there are the two serious objections, that, there being no such indication in the context here as in James, leading towards this meaning, the language would be very obscure; and that the whole section seems to bear on the relations of Christians with other recognised Christians,—having nothing in it to show that evangelistic effort among the unbelieving or the lapsed was at this point specially in the apostle's thoughts. (3) Yet again, the words may be taken as in Proverbs, "Love hides the faults of brethren." In favour of this sense it may be urged that where a passage of Scripture is quoted,—not, as in James, a mere convenient application made of certain words,—the presumption *prima facie* is that it is employed in

the sense of the original,—which therefore should be adhered to if it suits the context. The verses which follow show that what was at the moment foremost in Peter's mind was a wish to excite his readers to hearty unity and mutual helpfulness. Now obviously nothing can be imagined more destructive of peace and comfort in any Christian community than its including members who are quick to take offence, or who pry into the affairs of their brethren, and rake out into the sunlight faults and imprudences. On the other hand, the love which never seeks to know evil of others, and in all circumstances shuns and discourages needless talk on such matters, is plainly a most blessed binding power, the cement of the Christian temple ; cf. Matt. xviii. 15–17, 21, 22 ; Luke xvii. 3, 4 ; 1 Cor. viii. 12. To Peter personally the remembrance of the conversation related in Matt. xviii. 21, 22, would, as regarded "hiding" wrongs by forgiving and forgetting them, give a peculiar intensity and vastness of reference to the expression "a *multitude* of sins." The use of the expression ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σέ in Luke xvii. 4, shows it to be legitimate to take ἁμαρτίαι, in our passage, in the sense of "faults" or "offences" committed in the intercourse of brethren with each other.

The connecting particle ὅτι implies that the statement made in the clause is one which obviously presents a strong motive to Christians for "having their love to one another fervent." Such a motive is actually set forth on any view of the meaning: whether on any one of the views more force and obviousness of motive present themselves than on the others can, perhaps, hardly be determined. On the whole, the last view of the reference of the clause, according to which its meaning in Peter is the same which it undoubtedly has in its original place in Proverbs, appears to be the most likely. There seems to be a greater suitableness and naturalness in attaching to an appeal for the cultivation of brotherly love mention of a motive derived from the increased peace and comfort of the whole Christian community, than in attaching one immediately based on the personal good of the individual.

The quotation *ἀγάπη κτλ.* is found also in Clem. Rom. § 49, and in the Ancient Homily formerly called the 2nd Epistle of Clement, § 16,—in both places exactly as in Peter. The reference of the homilist is undoubtedly to covering one's own sins; that of Clement is uncertain, but not improbably to covering the sins of others.

Vv. 9–11. In these verses we have certain fruits of brotherly love exhibited,—first (ver. 9), a generous use of worldly property for the benefit of brethren; and secondly, (vv. 10, 11), a generous use, for their good, of spiritual gifts.

Ver. 9. Hospitality was a duty to which the circumstances of the primitive Christians afforded a peculiarly frequent and urgent call. In many cases converts were, through the cruelty of kinsfolk, or through other forms of persecution, reduced to penury, and rendered for a time literally homeless: and "even when the business occasions of believers merely took them temporarily from home, they must have shrunk from the contamination of the heathen inns along the road as much as from the insult and outrage which they might meet with there" (Lillie). Hence with remarkable frequency and earnestness this duty of entertaining strangers is urged in N. T., especially on office-bearers (1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8); but this not at all as if the duty were incumbent on these only, but because in this, as in all Christian excellences, those who bear office should be "ensamples to the flock." All believers (Rom. xii. 13; Heb. xiii. 2; 3 John 5, 6) were to keep in mind that their Master had expressly declared that a characteristic of true discipleship to which He would bear testimony from the throne was, "I was a stranger, and ye took me in." The praise of hospitality is very abundant in the earliest sub-apostolic writers: *e.g.* cf. Clem. Rom. §§ 1, 10, 11, 12; Hermas, *Mand.* viii.—"God loveth a *cheerful* giver" (2 Cor. ix. 7), and therefore, our apostle continues, to be acceptable to Him the hospitality must be shown cordially,—*ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ*, "without murmuring," secret or expressed, at the trouble and expense involved,—*μὴ ἐκ λύπης ἢ ἐξ ἀνάγκης*, as

Paul has it in the passage of 2 Cor. just referred to. For γογγυσμός, cf. Acts vi. 1; Phil. ii. 14: cf. also *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, iv. 7, οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ διδοὺς γογγύσεις (found *verbatim* also in Barnabas c. xix.). This last clause, enjoining *heartiness*, thorough sincerity, in Christian work, is characteristic of Peter: cf. i. 22, φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον; ii. 1, ἀποθέμενοι πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑποκρίσεις.

Ver. 10. In the free exercise of spiritual gifts, also, for the benefit of Christian brethren, love is to show itself; cf. Clem. Rom. §§ 38, 48. The word χάρισμα has in N. T. usage something of a specialty of application to those extraordinary powers which in the first ages of the Church were bestowed by the Holy Ghost on many believers (cf. *e.g.* Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 4, 9, 28); and this is no doubt the primary reference in the present passage. But in such a precept as that given here, natural abilities also are plainly included, being in all men "endowments" from God, in the Christian such in double measure—as given by Him at first, and as quickened and consecrated by His grace: cf. Rom. xii. 6–8, where, under the name of χαρίσματα, gifts, ordinary and extraordinary, are grouped together. With regard to all the powers which God has bestowed on them, then, believers are ever to bear in mind that these have been given not to be held as private property, for their own personal edification and comfort merely, but to be dealt with as belonging to God, and entrusted to their charge for the benefit of all the brotherhood. Each Christian is to regard himself as an οἰκονόμος for the οἶκος of Christ—appointed to see that from the "gifts" placed in his hands all the members of the household receive their portion in due season (Luke xii. 42). If every believer be animated by brotherly love to obey the precept, then through the joint action the whole household will partake of the full blessing, ποικίλης χάριτος Θεοῦ, "God's grace" (here collective, the entire gracious bestowment, the aggregate of the χαρίσματα) "manifold" (rich in its variety),—"each as (in the measure in which) he has received a gift" (the aorist ἔλαβεν pointing

back strictly to the time when the gift of grace was granted), "ministering it to one another" (literally, "into the midst of, among yourselves"), "as (in the capacity of, doing the part of) good (faithful) stewards of God's manifold grace."

Whilst *οἰκονόμος* is sometimes applied specially to office-bearers in the Church (1 Cor. iv. 1; Tit. i. 7), there is nothing whatever so to limit the reference here: *ἕκαστος* seems clearly to be general, "each believer," as in Rom. xii. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 7; Eph. iv. 7. To *αὐτό*, here, Bengel and others give an emphatic force, "it and not another,"—*q.d.* "taking care not to encroach on the sphere properly occupied by other men's gifts" ("id ipsum, non affectato alio," Bengel). But it seems very doubtful whether N. T. usage generally, or Peter's in particular, justifies us in finding any emphasis in the pronoun: cf. i. 12; Mark ix. 18; John xxi. 6; Col. ii. 14 (these last three references illustrating the quite unemphatic use of the pronoun as object in cases in which, as in the verse before us, it stands before the governing verb—a comparatively rare arrangement, and therefore one in which it might possibly be thought that *αὐτό* had emphasis through its position).—For *διακονεῖν* governing an accusative, cf. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 18.

Ver. 11. The subject of spiritual gifts is continued, the apostle passing on to impress upon his readers the importance of constantly cherishing grateful and reverential remembrance of the fact that all these endowments came from God. Nothing of a spirit of self-complacency in connection with the possession of any of the gifts, or of a desire for self-glorification in connection with the exercise of them, was to be entertained; but in everything God was to be acknowledged as their Giver, and the advancement of His cause as their purpose. Thus through the gifts He would be glorified, both in the hearts of those who received them, and in the hearts of others who were made sharers in the benefit. To this supremely important thought the reference in the previous verse to the "stewardship" of believers evidently directly leads.

Of the *χαρίσματα* the apostle, to present his precept in a

lively and impressive way, specifies two leading classes—those which were exercised through speech, as prophecy, teaching, hortatory and quickening address, and those which had as their sphere the Church agencies for such work as collecting and distributing money for the poor, and caring for the sick and for strangers (all summed up in the early Church under the general name *διακονία*, and probably also the same which are intended by Paul in 1 Cor. xii. 28 under the name *ἀντιλήψεις*, "services of help").

The injunctions of this verse are so plainly in close connection with those which precede—as part of a series,—that it is natural to regard the *participial* structure as still in the apostle's mind. The forms of the verbs to be supplied, therefore, are not *λαλείτω*, *διακονείτω*, but *λαλοῦντες*, *διακονοῦντες*, —the clauses introduced by *εἴ τις* standing connected with these participles very similarly to the way in which the clause with *ἕκαστος* in the previous verse is connected with *διακονοῦντες* expressed there. The particle *ὡς* has its very frequent force of representing the statement made as subjective: "If any man speaks, speaking" (or rather, for simplicity and clearness according to English idiom, the imperative "Speak ye") "with the full remembrance—and in a manner which shows your having the full remembrance—that you are speaking oracles of God; if any man engages in the work of Christian help, do it with the full and clearly-shown sense that you are doing it by the strength which God supplies."—In N. T., as in the classics, the word *λόγιον* is used in the sense of "a divine utterance:" cf. Acts vii. 38; Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12. The principle of the apostle's injunction here obviously holds whether,—as sometimes in the primitive Church, —a man was speaking what had been given him by the immediate extraordinary suggestion of the Divine Spirit, or simply communicating to his brethren the result of studies in the word of God, studies prosecuted under the ordinary guidance of the Spirit invoked by prayer. In 2 Cor. ii. 17 we have from Paul, set forth in detail, the right spirit and manner

of Christian "speaking," here stated by our apostle in the condensed form, *ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ*.—The verb *χορηγεῖν*, originally "to bring out, or defray the expense of bringing out, a chorus," came naturally enough among the drama-loving Athenians to be used for "to give abundant supply" generally. The verb in the simple form occurs in N. T. only here and in 2 Cor. ix. 10; somewhat more frequently the compound *ἐπιχορηγεῖν*, *e.g.* Gal. iii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 5.

The object of this remembrance and acknowledgement of God to which the apostle has been urging his readers is now explicitly stated: "that in them all (all the *χαρίσματα*, thus exercised with true Christian humility) God may be glorified through Jesus Christ." *Πᾶσιν* may be masculine, "in all (the brethren)," and so De Wette and (alternatively) Calvin take it,—but the other view seems decidedly more accordant with the apostle's course of thought. The essence of spiritual life is lovingly and joyously to recognise God as the Fountain of all good; and thus the supreme end of Church life is to "show forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light." This the Church does when, living to Him, she testifies continually that her life is *through* Him, that all her energies and beauties are "gifts" and "graces" from His hand. Conscious ever too of her own unworthiness, she knows, feels, testifies that as only "through Jesus Christ" her spiritual emancipation was granted to her by God, so only through Him can her answering praise go up before God with acceptance; cf. ii. 5, note.

This statement of aim leads the apostle naturally, according to the impulses of the new life, to lift up his own soul, and invite his readers to unite with him in a direct doxology to God,—which at the same time is in its form, through the use of the present indicative (*ἐστίν*), an express statement that "the glory" (here, in the connection, the glory of redemption and of all its blessings and "gifts" to the Church) "and the might" (by which the work of redemption was wrought out, and will throughout eternity have all its blessed results main-

tained) are God's. Thus this doxology, whilst a true direct lifting up of the soul to God, presents at the same time the *ground* of the preceding ἵνα δοξάζηται. The natural reference of the relative ᾧ therefore seems not to be to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, but, as has been assumed in the outline just given, to Θεός, the subject of the clause; cf. Winer, p. 196.—The form of the doxology here is very nearly as in Rev. i. 6; cf. also Rev. v. 13.—For ἐστίν in a doxology, cf. Rom. i. 25, and see note on i. 3.—In doxologies generally, as here (but not invariably; cf. Luke ii. 14; 1 Tim. i. 17; Jude 25), the article is found with δόξα, κράτος, and other substantives similarly used. It may in such cases have its usual force when attached to abstract nouns—presenting the "glory," "might," and the rest, in their utmost breadth of reference, and thus setting forth the fulness of the ascription of praise; or it may mean "that which is due, which it is right, and which all God's moral creatures, unless wilfully blinded, feel it to be right to ascribe to Him;" cf. Winer, p. 134. Probably both thoughts are intended. In the present passage the articles accord with the close relation of the doxology to the verb δοξάζηται in the immediately preceding clause.

The expression εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, frequent in N. T., is of O. T. origin, being a LXX. rendering for לְעוֹלָמִים (Ps. lxxvii. 8), as also for the sing. לְעוֹלָם (Ps. civ. 31). The strengthened form found in the present passage, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, —also frequent in N. T., particularly in Revelation,—accords likewise with LXX. forms, εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος (Ps. xix. 10), εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος (Ps. xlv. 7). The expression is evidently intended to present the thought of eternity in the very strongest way, answering to our English "for ever and ever." It is formed on the analogy of such Hebrew superlative combinations as קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים, and the like. The exact form of the conception seems to be that of a series of ages flowing on endlessly, in each of which a number of other shorter ages are gathered up.

Vv. 12–19. *Persecution for Christ's sake should be deemed an honour and a ground of rejoicing.*

From iii. 13 to the end of the Epistle the difficulties and temptations specially connected with persecution are evidently so much in the apostle's mind throughout, that a reference to some aspect of this particular form of trial may present itself naturally enough at any point. In the present section he enters into this subject somewhat systematically, directing attention more distinctly than elsewhere to the deep and varied sources of comfort which are open to the persecuted believer. It is not improbable that his taking up the theme in this way just at this point was immediately suggested by the doxology in ver. 11. In any age of the Church, Christians, unless thoughtful and mature, are apt to be startled and to find themselves prone to impatience if sudden and severe trouble fall upon them. To the Church of apostolic times—exulting, as we now do, in the knowledge that their Saviour had become Head over all things *for the Church*, and with no record of the experience of any past generations of His people, such as we possess, to guide their judgement with respect to the mode in which for their good He would administer His authority—persecution must have been peculiarly surprising and depressing. It is true that, in His addresses to His disciples, the Lord had frequently warned them that they ought to be prepared for the bitter hostility of the world; but, amid the glow of hope in the young Church, these intimations were very likely to be by a large proportion of the members forgotten. As Peter himself had in former days "thought it strange" that his Lord should suffer (Matt. xvi. 22), so practical proof that by the Ruler of the universe it was for a time to be permitted that those who loved and served Him should suffer insult and wrong at the hands of those who hated Him, must to a multitude of Christians have come as a most painful surprise,—at first even to the extent of

utter bewilderment. Where this sense of wonderment existed in some degree, a doxology to God expressly as the Author of the blessings of redemption, as in ver. 11, was plainly fitted to bring up the feeling with vividness: and now, accordingly, as if hearing from his suffering brethren the cry, "How strange this dealing of our God and Father!" the apostle makes answer, with an intensity of affectionate appeal marked by his use of *ἀγαπητοί*, which is a very rare form of address with him in this Epistle (cf. ii. 11). He reminds them that affliction is one of the modes through which God confers His highest blessing of spiritual quickening, and that therefore nothing was more in accordance with His character as the God of salvation, and more fitted to call forth from enlightened minds grateful praise, than that very discipline by trouble which to some of them seemed "strange."

Ver. 12. On *ξενίζω* cf. iv. 4, note. The dative joined to the verb here is that of the instrument: "be not surprised by;" cf. Polyb. iii. 8, *ἐξενίζοντο τῷ τὸ συμβεβηκὸς εἶναι παρὰ τὴν προσδοκίαν*. This view, that the dative is instrumental (on which cf. T. S. Green, *Crit. Notes, in loc.*), seems to be simpler and more natural than that of Winer (p. 262), who, in his explanation of the construction, associates *ξενίζεσθαι* with *ἀπολογεῖσθαι* and other verbs, in which some shade of the idea of "direction towards" is involved. The joining to the verb of an instrumental dative here, and of *ἐν* in ver. 4, answers exactly to the freedom with which in English we may pass from "surprised by" to "surprised at." That in the present instance the sense of "strangeness" was of a kind to depress and sadden—obvious from the nature of the case—is brought out particularly by the use of the strong adversative *ἀλλά* at the beginning of the next verse, placing *χαίρετε* in contrast with *ξενίζεσθε*.—The word *πύρωσις* occurs also in Rev. xviii. 9, 18, but only here in the figurative sense. In LXX. it is found in Prov. xxvii. 21, with the sense of "trial (of metals) by fire;" cf. the use of the verb *πυροῦσθαι* in Rev. iii. 18. In the present passage, however, it is plain that the word,

taken by itself, simply sets forth the severity of the persecution,—the gracious purpose of the affliction, as "trial," being presented in the next clause: cf. i. 8. Compare also an interesting parallel, possibly a reminiscence of this passage, in *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, xvi. 5, τότε (that is, in the age immediately preceding Christ's Second Advent) ἥξει ἡ κτίσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὴν πύρωσιν τῆς δοκιμασίας.—Ἐν ὑμῖν means "among you," the persecution immediately affecting only certain individuals in the Christian community. The case, however, is one illustrating with much distinctness the way in which ἐν came to have this secondary sense of "among," —for the trouble was "in" a body so organized that, when one member suffered, there was sympathetic pain throughout the whole. — The article τῇ implies that the "burning" is already distinctly before the minds of the readers, the present participle γινομένῃ intimating indeed that it is not merely imminent (as the mode of expression in the A. E. V. naturally suggests), but already begun. Nothing more, however, than the simple fact of the existence of the πύρωσις is, by the way in which the article is employed, assumed as known. The participial clause, having no article, is predicative, — the emphatic words πρὸς πειρασμόν setting forth the thought which explains the divine dealing, and which those Christians who "thought it strange" had plainly for the moment forgotten. To the combination with the article, exhibiting something already known, new information is added by this participial combination without the article. The meaning is: "Be not astonished at it,—coming upon you as it does (or, seeing that it comes upon you) for the purpose of trial." For a precisely similar construction, cf. John ii. 9, τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγενημένον, "the water, which had now become wine,"—the fact of the changing to wine being here stated for the first time, and the participle accordingly left without the article.

In the familiar construction exemplified in the last clause of the verse, a genitive absolute introduced by ὡς, the ὡς simply places the statement in a subjective connection, and

is often best rendered by "thinking that," "saying that," or the like; cf. *e.g.* 1 Cor. iv. 18; 2 Cor. v. 20; and see Jelf, § 701; Winer, p. 770; A. Buttmann, p. 318.—Bengel and some other expositors regard *συμβαίνοντος* as in antithesis with *πρὸς πειρασμὸν γινομένῃ*, stress being laid on *συμβαίνοντος* as involving an idea of *chance*, and the thought thus obtained, that what was really being done by God in His providence for a gracious end was perhaps by some of the apostle's readers looked at in moments of faithless impatience as merely "*happening*" blindly, aimlessly,—or, more exactly, that their feeling about the matter was as if they regarded it in this way. It is probable that such a feeling was entertained by some of them, and reference to it by Peter would have been perfectly relevant to his course of remark. But the idea does not seem to be expressed. Nothing in the position of the words of the clause suggests a special emphasis on *συμβαίνοντος*, nor does the use of this verb elsewhere in N. T. naturally lead a reader to think specially of blind chance; cf. *e.g.* Acts xx. 19; 1 Cor. x. 11. Neither does the circumstance that by giving prominence to the idea of chance we obtain a new and distinct thought, while otherwise the clause, coming after *μὴ ξενίζεσθε*, may appear tautological, seem to have much weight. The simple fact that, having written *ξενίζεσθε*, the apostle afterwards uses the cognate adjective *ξένου*, shows that on this word the stress of the clause lies,—the apostle having mainly before his mind the error of deeming the coming of persecution upon Christians to be "a strange thing," when Christ Himself had plainly pointed out that persecution arose naturally out of the antagonism of the spirit of the world to the Spirit of God. The clause is tautological only as, through the expansion of thoughts that are felt to be important, tautology enters into all speaking and writing which aims at popular impression and conviction.

Ver. 13. In this verse the apostle reminds his readers that those of them to whom persecution for Christ's sake seemed

"strange," had forgotten that Jesus was the Forerunner of His people as well as their Saviour and Lord, and that, as He had passed to the crown by way of the cross, so must His followers do. For personal sanctification, and for the good, in various ways, of fellow-believers, Christians must suffer, each in his sphere "filling up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ, for His body's sake, which is the Church" (Col. i. 24). Spiritual religion being Christlike, and the world hating Christ, it follows that an invariable attendant of spiritual religion is in some form "participation in the sufferings of Christ." All down the generations the Lord's word holds, "If they have persecuted Me, they will also persecute you." The other part of the truth on the subject is, "It is a faithful saying, If we suffer we shall also reign with Him." On the basis of this divine order, first suffering with Christ, then glory with Him, the apostle rests his present precept, "See that now ye accept the trial in a Christian spirit, in order that, being thus proved true believers, ye may have the blessed experiences of believers in the day of the Lord's appearing;" cf. Rom. viii. 17, where also we have *ἵνα*, intimating God's aim in sending the sufferings—which, being cordially acquiesced in by His people, becomes their aim in bearing them. But Peter presents the duty in a specially interesting and pointed form. Under both kinds of experience—that now of trouble, and that by and by of glory—the true Christian spirit is essentially the *same*. In the measure of the liveliness and intelligence of his faith, the believer "*rejoices* in the Lord *alway*" (Phil. iv. 4), yea, he "glories in tribulations also" (Rom. v. 3). Though, on the surface of his nature, "in heaviness" (*λυπηθείς*), when "manifold trials" come upon him (i. 6), yet deep down in his heart he has rest, joy, because he knows that the trials come from his Father, and are intended and fitted to make him more holy. Thus the precept can take the form, "Rejoice in tribulation now, that ye may rejoice in glory hereafter."

Καθό is an adverb of proportion, not therefore "inasmuch as" (A. V.) in the ordinary causal sense of that combination, but in its strict etymological sense, "according as," "in proportion as:" cf. Rom. viii. 26; 2 Cor. viii. 12. The more abundant the "participation in Christ's sufferings," the ampler to the enlightened Christian mind is the ground of joy.—That construction of the verb *κοινωνεῖν* which is found here, with a dative of the thing participated in, is the usual one in N. T., in place of the ordinary classical construction with the genitive: cf. Rom. xii. 13, xv. 27; 1 Tim. v. 22; 2 John 11. The genitive is found only in Heb. ii. 14. The construction with a dative of the thing was originally, in all likelihood, an extension of the regular construction of this verb with a dative of the person, and implied "communion with" rather than "participation in," there being thus an approach to personification of the object: cf. especially 1 Tim. v. 22; 2 John 11; and see Winer, p. 250; A. Buttmann, p. 160; Ellicott on Gal. vi. 6.—On *ἀποκάλυψις*, cf. i. 7, 13. Most naturally, instead of, as in these other places, "the revelation of Christ," we have here "the revelation of His glory,"—the thought of the out-flashing of the glory pressing itself on the writer's mind, in vivid contrast with the previous time of obscuration in the Lord's life of humiliation, and in the long ages of seemingly triumphant persecution of His people by the wicked.—According to N. T. usage *χαρῆτε ἐν* may go together in construction, "may rejoice in the revelation" (as the ground of your joy). But seeing that *χαίρετε* in the first part of the sentence stands absolutely, and that in a sentence of this kind a reader instinctively looks for a note of time,—"hereafter," expressed in some way, in contrast with the sombre-hued present,—it seems most natural to take *χαρῆτε* also as absolute, and *ἐν* as temporal; so in the other places, i. 7, 13.—To *χαρῆτε* is attached *ἀγαλλιώμενοι*; cf. i. 6, 8,—also Matt. v. 12, a passage which, looking at the context there and here, was not improbably in the apostle's mind in writing the words before us. In contrast with the simple *χαίρετε* of the first

clause, which enjoins a joy that in its nature is a triumph of faith over sense, pain and "heaviness" being often present, is here placed the "exulting" joy of the day of the Lord, when the happiness of God's children will have no shadows.

Ver. 14. The precept of ver. 13, *χαίρετε*, implying obviously "Ye have abundant grounds of joy," ver. 14 amplifies this implied statement. The special reference in the first clause to reproach for Christ's sake is seemingly a reminiscence of Matt. v. 11, and was not improbably suggested by the immediately preceding words *χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι*; cf. last note. "If the men of the world reproach you and treat you with contempt, in that very fact you are blessed, because your being hated for Christ's sake by the world which hated and crucified Him gives proof that His Spirit,—the Spirit of God,—through whose influences alone God's moral creatures have true glory, is resting upon you. Thus the very contempt which you endure is really an honour, and ought to be to you a source of happiness." Reproach against the Christians as *ἄθεοι*, as fools, as kill-joys, and the like, was no doubt very common everywhere; and from the liability of the believers to meet with this particular form of persecution, not merely on occasions for which their energies might be deliberately braced up, such as judicial investigations, but at every turn of ordinary social life, it must have been peculiarly harassing and wearying. This form of trouble is specified by the apostle again and again; cf. ii. 12, iii. 16, iv. 4.

The most satisfactory explanation of the various applications which are made in N. T. of the expression *ἐν ὀνόματι* is afforded by looking back to the original local sense of the preposition. The "name" is regarded as, so to speak, an element or atmosphere surrounding whatever is referred to as said or done. "Within" this atmosphere the command is given, the act performed, and the like,—that is to say, a special and indeed essential connection is exhibited as existing between whatever is referred to and him "in" whose "name" it takes place. In most cases, naturally, "in the

name of God," or "of Christ," means "in recognition of God, Christ, as the source of some authority or power which is exercised, or as the object of veneration and love." In the place before us the application of the expression is obviously different, but is also quite accordant with its general force; the reproach spoken of is "in express connection with Christ," *i.e.* is specifically on the ground of the profession of discipleship to Him, and loyalty to His authority. Closely similar is the use of *εἰς ὄνομα*, Matt. x. 41, 42, where we read of receiving a prophet *εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου*, "expressly as, or because he is, a prophet;" cf. also Mark ix. 41, and see Winer, p. 487. For perfect clearness as to the meaning, it seems best in the present passage to render by "*for* the name of Christ." — The form of expression *ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ* (as also *τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Heb. xi. 26) was possibly somewhat determined by a remembrance of Ps. lxxxix. (lxxxviii. Sept.) 50, 51.—On *μακάριοι*, cf. iii. 14, note.

The mode of expression in *τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πνεῦμα* is somewhat peculiar, and the words have been explained in several ways. (1) From the previous clause Hofmann would supply *ὄνομα* to govern *δόξης*,—with little naturalness, and no very satisfying sense. (2) *Τὸ τῆς δόξης* may be taken as meaning "what belongs to, or is implied in, glory" (cf. *e.g.* Matt. xxi. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 22); and on certain classical analogies (cf. Jelf, §§ 380. 1, 436, *Obs.* 1) this has been held by some expositors to be equivalent to the simple "glory." But no reason whatever can be suggested why Peter should use such a singular expression in the present connection as "what belongs to glory," "the element, or principle, of glory" (Plumptre); and the employment of the combination with the force of the simple noun has no support in N. T. usage. (3) Accepting the construction which *prima facie* seems the natural one, namely, that both genitives are governed by *Πνεῦμα*, Bengel is disposed to regard *δόξα* here (as also in Eph. i. 17 and Jas. ii. 1) as

an appellation of Christ, and therefore to translate thus, "the Spirit of The Glory and of God." This is ingenious and interesting, but the passages cited do not by any means sufficiently support the view that "glory" is a personal appellation. (4) A perfectly satisfactory sense is obtained by following the same construction, but taking δόξα with its ordinary force as an abstract: "the Spirit of glory (the Spirit, Himself glorious, whose resting on any of God's moral creatures brings them true glory, by producing in them a likeness of character to God) and of God,"—the "and," with a measure of ascensive power almost = "yea, indeed," bringing in the mention of that name which sums up all good and all glory. The repeated τό accords with a usage occasionally found in the best classical writers, in cases where to one substantive are attached two attributes — adjectives, substantives with prepositions, or governed genitives—somewhat distinct from each other in kind, and both important; thus, τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερόν, Plat. *Rep.* viii. p. 565 (Steph.): cf. Jelf, § 459. 5; Winer, p. 165. No instance given in the grammars has a καί, the attributes being simply placed side by side; but καί here is obviously (see above) quite natural. The feeling which in such cases dictated to the Greeks the repetition of the article is illustrated in our own language. We say instinctively not "the Spirit of glory and God," but "the Spirit of glory and of God," the repetition of the preposition serving with us the same purpose as in Greek the repetition of the article.

The exquisite thought of the Spirit of God "resting" on a soul, as in a home, is found also in O. T.; and indeed it seems exceedingly likely that, as is his wont, the apostle is here quoting a passage (Isa. xi. 2) with changes suited to his line of thought. The passage occurs in one of the chief predictions of Messiah,—of whom it is declared, ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, LXX. Through recalling this O. T. prophecy, the apostle's language was manifestly fitted to give his readers a measure of support and cheer even

beyond what was directly conveyed by the words, inasmuch as it reminded them that the Spirit who rested on them was the same who had rested on their Lord, and had strengthened Him for that life of suffering from which He had ascended to glory. On *ἐπί* with the accusative even with verbs of rest, cf. ii. 24, note.

From some cause—possibly frequent oral citation and amplification in times of persecution—an unusual amount of textual variation is found in this verse. Two of the variants claim notice. After *δόξης* a considerable number of authorities, some of them early, insert *καὶ δυνάμεως*. The words are suitable to the context, but their omission by the best ancient witnesses, and the fact that those which have the addition present it in somewhat different forms, sufficiently show it not to belong to the original text. Again, at the close of the verse stands in T. R. the clause *κατὰ μὲν αὐτοὺς βλασφημεῖται, κατὰ δὲ ὑμᾶς δοξάζεται*. This is quite inadequately supported, and seems to have been originally a gloss on the verse: "Among them (or, as regards them, so far as they are concerned—your persecutors, namely) He (the Spirit of God) is blasphemed (in that those beliefs and modes of conduct which are due to Him, and show His presence with you, are with them a ground for speaking of you reproachfully), but among you He is glorified" (that is, seemingly, from the antithesis with *βλασφημεῖται*, "is praised"). The author of the gloss appears to have taken the expression "the Spirit of glory" to mean not specially, what probably in the connection it does mean, "the Spirit from whom alone glory comes to His creatures," but generally, "the Spirit to whom all glory belongs" (as His people know, and acknowledge by their praises).

Vv. 15, 16. These verses give the reason for the emphasis which, as all readers feel, rests on the words "in the name of Christ," in the previous sentence. "In what I have said of your being blessed under reproach, I have specified as an absolutely essential condition, that the reproach be distinctly

on the ground of your calling yourselves and living as Christians; for no man who suffers for evil-doing of any kind has the slightest right, on the ground of his taking to himself the name of Christian, to count his suffering a source of blessedness or glory. He who suffers strictly as a Christian may justly so count it, and may praise God for it." In all ages the Church of Christ has had unworthy members, in some instances members guilty of gross crimes. In a vast proportion of such cases the criminal has, no doubt, the fullest knowledge that the religion which he professes is in no way responsible for his wickedness,—that indeed he has acted in direct defiance of its dictates. In times of peculiar excitement, however,—as amid the glow of heart which in the days of the primitive Church connected itself with the then new and startling teaching about the kingdom of Christ, in which all men were free and equal, or later, amid Fifth Monarchy agitations in the time of the English Commonwealth, amid the London riots of 1780, and the like,—the motives by which men are led on to criminal acts, even to murder, may easily include, and no doubt often have included, a certain religious enthusiasm, in singular and unhallowed union with greed and brutality. On cases of this kind the apostle's precept seems from its connection intended specially to bear,—its form at the same time being general.

Ver. 15. As occasionally, in place of the statement of a reason, which we expect after γάρ, there is substituted with liveliness and naturalness a precept implying and based on the statement; cf. Heb. xii. 3. Of the connection of γάρ with imperatives, this is perhaps a more natural explanation than that which goes back to the original sense of the particle, according to its components γέ and ἄρα, and translates the word in this case "verily," "yea," or the like. The mind demands a closer connection than such a translation gives. On the sense and use of γάρ generally, cf. Winer, p. 558 foll. — "Murderer," "thief," and "evil-

doer," obviously belong to one class, which in fact the last word, general and summary, is meant to define,—the class of "evil-doers" in a universally understood sense; whereas the "meddler in other men's matters" is the representative of that large class who, through folly rather than wickedness, become mischief-makers, disturbers of social order, and this sometimes to the extent that their conduct may reasonably be visited not merely with the censure of public opinion, but with penalties inflicted by the law. The apostle indicates that these two classes are before his mind as distinct, by the position which he gives to ὡς, the first ὡς covering the first three words, while ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος has the particle repeated for itself. The singularly expressive and pointed word ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, "an overseer of what belongs to other people," occurs here only in N. T., and elsewhere only once or twice in ecclesiastical writers,—and was possibly formed by the apostle. References to the evil of this kind of conduct, however, occur again and again: cf. 1 Thess. iv. 11; 1 Tim. v. 13. One can easily believe that, in many Christians, a natural tendency to meddle with matters of various kinds with which they had no proper concern, might be intensified by a misapprehension as to what was involved in the duty of believers to "shine as lights in the world." Knowing that they had received instruction from heaven affecting every question, great or small, on which moral principles bore, they might be apt to obtrude their knowledge in such circumstances, and in such modes, as by their procedure to irritate instead of winning those around them. Error of this kind was not confined to the first Christian age. On ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος Wetstein aptly cites Horace's *Aliena negotia curo* (*Sat.* ii. 3. 19), and Terence's *Tantumne est ab re tua otii tibi Aliena ut cures, eaque nihil quæ ad te attinent?* (*Heaut.* i. 1. 23).

Ver. 16. For the ellipsis in the protasis, the mind at once from the first clause of the previous verse supplies τὶς πάσχει.—The name "Christians"—Christ's people, adherents,

on the analogy of "Cæsarians," "Pompeians," and similar names of parties—originated, as we are told in Acts xi. 26, at Antioch. There can be little doubt that it arose among the heathen, when they began to distinguish the followers of Jesus from the Jews. Involving as the form of the name does, or may be taken to do, an assertion that Jesus was the Christ promised in O. T., we may be certain that it was not given by the Jews; and though it came before long (see *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, xii. 4; Ignat. *Rom.* § 3) to be used with pleasure by Christians themselves, yet N. T. usage seems to show that it did not originate among them, and indeed was not accepted by them in the first age. They still called themselves "the brethren," "the believers," "the saints." The word *Χριστιανός* occurs in only two passages besides Acts xi. 26; and in both there is the suggestion of a name habitually employed by the enemies of Christ. In the familiar statement of Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 28), the circumstances, the character of the speaker, and particularly the parallelism in Paul's magnificent reply, lead one to think that, as used by the king, the name *Χριστιανός* connoted a person despised and liable to bonds. Similarly in the verse now before us *ὡς* indicates, or at least suggests, that the form of accusation was, "This man is a Christian,"—just as in the cases supposed in the previous verse it would be, "This man is a murderer," or "a thief." A most interesting illustration of this "as a Christian" is afforded by the words of Pliny to Trajan, with reference to the forms of judicial procedure against Christians of Asia Minor, in the beginning of the second century; see Introd. § I. 9. Similarly, with respect to the latter half of the second century, we learn from the Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (ch. 10) that the Christians there *συνεκλείοντο ὡς Χριστιανοὶ, μηδεμιᾶς ἄλλης αἰτίας αὐτοῖς ἐπιφερομένης*; cf. also Justin's *Second Apology*, c. 2.

On *δοξαζέτω τὸν Θεόν* Bengel says well, "Poterat Petrus, antitheti vi, dicere, 'honori sibi ducat;' sed honorem Deo

resignandum esse docet." The suffering believer is to "glorify God"—to praise Him for having given His servant blessing and honour—*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ*. Some expositors take these last words as equivalent to another reading, not so well supported, *ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ* (for which cf. 2 Cor. iii. 10, ix. 3), "in this respect, department, matter,"—the *name* or *heading* standing for the matter itself. Seeing, however, that the words come immediately after the mention of the name "Christian," as being that, the simple bearing of which was of itself deemed by the heathen a ground of punishment, the natural reference of *ὄνομα* seems quite decidedly to be to this same name. The name which the heathen applied as a reproach was to be reckoned by the persecuted as an honour, because it represented suffering for and with the Saviour. The preposition *ἐν* is employed here, as often in N. T., to express the occasion or ground of the action (cf. Winer, p. 484), —a use in the present case particularly natural, seeing that *δοξαζέτω Θεὸν ἐν* is simply a slight extension of the familiar construction *χαίρειν ἐν, ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι ἐν, καυχᾶσθαι ἐν*, and the like. Here, as with regard to *ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ* in ver. 14, the best English rendering is perhaps "*for* this name."

Polycarp has an echo of this verse (§ 8): *ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν.*

Vv. 17, 18. In these verses we see proof that the solemn statement of ver. 7, "The end of all things is at hand," is still prominently before the apostle's mind. Immediately, however, they stand in close logical connection with the injunction of the previous verse, exhibiting a strong ground why the believer, if called to "suffer as a Christian," should "glorify God for this name." By this suffering—at the heaviest and the longest a "light affliction which is but for a moment"—he may naturally have brought impressively before him the thought how vast beyond all estimate is the woe from which as a Christian he is saved through God's grace. "If even you, the children of God, have because of sin to be subjected

to such sore trial, how awful must be the doom of God's enemies—that doom from which His mercy saves you!" That such is the course of the argument, and that what the apostle specially intends to present to the minds of his readers is the grace of God in saving them from the unspeakable punishment of the lost, is plain on a careful examination of the passage in its connection both with the close of ver. 16 and with the exhortation of ver. 19. He does not state the thought fully, however, and in the abbreviated representation there is a singular impressiveness. He gives in outline the *a fortiori* argument from the sufferings of Christians to the sufferings of unbelievers,—and there he pauses. Setting his Christian readers face to face with a misery which he does not attempt to describe, but only suggests by an unanswered question,—Peter leaves it to their own hearts to ponder the love which to them makes this unspeakable doom a subject of contemplation merely, not of experience.

Ver. 17. Whilst formally belonging only to the statement which occupies the first part of the verse, ὅτι logically belongs to that statement as applied by the hypothetical sentence which forms the second part, and this (see summary of the argument, above) regarded also in connection with a further unexpressed thought. On the frequent co-ordination, in Hellenistic style, of clauses, one of which is in the course of thought subordinate to the other, cf. i. 24, note on use of διότι.

The apostle opens his argument by the statement that "The time is come" (or simply that "It is the time," the easy and familiar supplement ἐστί being sufficient, the somewhat harder πάρεστι unnecessary) "for the judgement to begin from the house of God." It is shown not merely by the general course of thought, but expressly by the parallel in the next clause, ἀφ' ἡμῶν, that by "the house of God" is meant, according to the well-known N. T. figure, the Church of Christ; cf. 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 6. In the present place, and in the passage just referred to in Timothy (whatever

may be the case in that in Hebrews), the representation seems to be not of "a house" in the secondary use of the word, as equivalent to "a family," but in its primary sense of "a building," God's temple: cf. ii. 5, also 1 Cor. iii. 16; Eph. ii. 21. The general force of the apostle's statement, then, viewed in its connection, is this,—that, looking up from the immediate human agencies, his readers should regard their persecutions as manifestations of the divine judgement, and that the time in which they were living was one when the judgement was to begin with God's own people. God deals as Judge with all sin committed by any of His moral creatures. But His judicial dealings with Christians are at the same time, through His grace, Fatherly chastisements, and—being such, and intended to meeten spiritually for heaven—they belong only to this earthly life. Thus all the sufferings of believers are the beginnings of that divine judgement upon sin—"*the* judgement," as the apostle has it expressly,—the full development and terribleness of which will be seen in what is commonly called specifically "the Day of Judgement." In that day believers, "finding mercy of the Lord," shall know nothing of condemning judgement, but shall stand clothed in the righteousness of their Redeemer. Then shall be the judgement of the enemies of God. It is true that they, too, during their life on earth have sufferings, and that these, in their case also, are judgements of God; but in the dark shadow of the awfulness of final judgement these divine dealings with unbelievers during this life pass utterly out of the apostle's view. Thus to his eye the beginnings of judgement are strictly and simply with the spiritual temple of God, God's own people. For illustration of Peter's course of thought here, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 31, 32,—a passage which shows in a pointed way how such a statement as the present, regarding *κρίμα* coming on believers, is harmonized with its verbal contradictory, John iii. 18, *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται*: that *κρίνεσθαι* which in its nature is a *παιδεύεσθαι* is intended to prevent the *κατακρίνεσθαι* which is meant

by *κρίνεσθαι* in the passage in John (cf. also iv. 6, with note).

In speaking of "the time" for the judgement to begin from the house of God, the apostle refers seemingly to the Christian Dispensation. Doubtless, in the ages before the Lord's incarnation also there had been disciplinary judgements on believers. The apostle, however, appears to look at these rather as having been premonitory of, than as themselves belonging to, "*the* judgement;" seeing that of God's dealings with the world final judgement was not then the next great stage. In those days the great Revealer of God was yet to be manifested. Now He has come,—everything which, consistently with the glory of His character and government, God can do to touch the hearts of men, and lead them to Himself, has been done,—the Christian Dispensation is "the last time," the close of which is the Day of Judgement; and of what will thus be the special work of the next great manifest divine intervention in human history we have the beginnings presented now in the sufferings of believers. Such seems to be the apostle's meaning: "Unum idemque est judicium a tempore evangelii per apostolos prædicati usque ad judicium extremum" (Bengel).

Another possible view of Peter's teaching here regarding the *καιρός* is this,—that he would have us understand that there are in the history of the world certain periods in which, by the sending of calamities, God signally shows Himself to men as Judge, beginning with His own people, and passing on to send far more terrible troubles upon those who oppose and persecute them. The age in which Peter wrote, he—on this view of his meaning—intimates to be such a period. The commencement of the judgement was seen in the persecution to which the Christians were exposed; and its further stage, one may suppose, was to be the awful visitation which, a very few years after the date of this Epistle, befell the Jews, the virulent enemies of the Christians and keen instigators of persecution, in the destruction of Jerusalem. This view, of a

series of καιροί, is perhaps consistent with the language employed,—naturally enough if καιρός alone be read, "*a* time," hardly so naturally if the article be read with it, in which case, on this view of the reference, the meaning apparently would be "*our* καιρός, that of our generation." It may be also that, in various prominent periods of persecution during the subsequent history of the Church, something in the sequence of judgements may be recognised similar to what was seen in the first age. A most serious difficulty in the way of accepting this view of the sense, however, lies in the fact that a reference simply to earthly calamities, as the judgements spoken of on the enemies of God, is quite incompatible with the deep solemnity of the apostle's words on this subject in the latter part of this verse and in the 18th. These words evidently point, if not solely, at least mainly, to the final Judgement. No doubt the fall of Jerusalem, echoing throughout the world, was fitted greatly to attract the attention of Christians everywhere, and—particularly when looked at in the light of our Lord's predictions—must have been felt to be both in itself a judgement and a notable prefiguration of the great final Judgement; but any interpretation which regards the καιρός spoken of by Peter as ending with the fall of Jerusalem, or which considers his words as pointing to it other than, if at all, in an altogether subsidiary way, appears beset with insuperable difficulties.

The use, according to a reading not certain but probable, of the article with καιρός, and the bareness of the form of statement, seem to imply that on some ground the thought here set forth by the apostle was deemed by him to be not unfamiliar to his readers. He had seemingly in his mind such passages in the prophets as Jer. xxv. 29, xlix. 12; Ezek. ix. 6; Amos iii. 2. These passages were fitted to prepare the minds of Christians alike for the thought of chastisement at the hand of God for their sins, and for the expectation that stern punishment would come on His and their adversaries; and it can hardly be doubted that by a

remembrance of the passage just referred to in Ezekiel the form of Peter's statement was moulded,—one of the clauses in that verse being "Begin at My sanctuary" (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἄρξασθε*, LXX.).—*Κρίμα*, which properly—according to the form of the word, and according to ordinary usage, classical and N. T.—means "the thing judged or decided, decree, sentence," is employed here, as occasionally (cf. John ix. 39; Acts xxiv. 25), according to a tendency to transitions of meaning seen in verbal substantives in all languages, with a reference to the *action* of judging, its force therefore being indistinguishable from that of *κρίσις*.—The construing of *ἄρχεσθαι* with *ἀπό*, to mark distinctly the starting-point of a course or series, is common in the classics,—particularly in Herodotus,—and occurs also often in N. T.; cf. *e.g.* Luke xxiv. 27; Acts i. 22.

In the second half of the verse the apostle shows the purpose which he had in making the statement in the first clause. This is to present an argument *a minori ad majus*, which he does in a hypothetical form (cf. our Lord's question, Luke xxiii. 31): "Now, if sin is so hateful in God's sight that even those who through faith are His children—loved and cherished by Him—are visited with judgements so sore as those which are come and coming upon you, what must be the fate of His enemies? If the beginnings of a growing tempest are such as you now experience, what will the end be which is destined for those who refuse the divine mercy?" The nature and the conclusiveness of the argument are clear; but there are two little peculiarities in the mode of expression which require a moment's notice. In that substantial repetition of the first clause of the verse, which constitutes the protasis of the hypothetical sentence, "Now, if first from us," it is plain—the words "from us" answering to "from the house of God" of the previous clause—that "it (the judgement) begins (*ἄρχεται*)" is to be supplied. With *ἄρχεται* the adverb *πρῶτον* is, strictly speaking, pleonastic, but it is not therefore useless, because it shows vividly the

stress which the apostle lays on the point of the *beginning*,—"If the *first* visitation of judgement, the *first* stage in an accelerating course, be such." In the apodosis, also—the question "What shall the end be?"—there is something of peculiarity. A reader instinctively regards this "end" as correlative with that "beginning" to which the words ἄρχεται and πρῶτον have both drawn attention,—the "end" therefore being "the closing stage of judgement." Yet this reference of τέλος does not answer well to the connection in which that substantive stands with τῶν ἀπειθούντων κτλ.,—"the end of them who disobey" seeming to be a somewhat forced, unnaturally constructed expression, if taken to mean "the end of the judgement, which is the stage belonging to, destined for, those who disobey." It appears more natural to think that we have here a well-known use of τέλος for "the end, or issue, of a man's life or character" (cf. 2 Cor. xi. 15; Phil. iii. 19); and a comparison of the parallel clause in the next verse, ποῦ φανεῖται, confirms the idea that this latter use of τέλος was in the apostle's mind, and was indeed prominent. Taking all the data into consideration, the reasonable conclusion seems to be, that, through the intensity of his emotion at this point, Peter has in his rush of thought laid on τέλος a double burden,—his thought fully exhibited being something like this, "If the beginning of judgement, in God's dealings with His own people, be so severe as you are now experiencing, what will the end of it be, when those who are disobedient to the gospel shall meet their end?"

On ἀπειθούντων τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, cf. ii. 8, τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες, with note. The expression "disobedient to the glad tidings" brings out very pointedly the truth that the invitations of the gospel are at the same time commands; and, as added here to "the gospel," the words "of God" have plainly a special force—emphasizing the awfulness of the criminality of ἀπείθεια.—In τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ (cf. Rom. i. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 2) the genitive is manifestly of the Originator and Sender; where Χριστοῦ is used (as Rom.

xv. 19; Phil. i. 27), the force of the case may be either this, or of the object presented, or quite possibly both, "the gospel which comes from Christ and which tells of Christ."

Ver. 18. In this verse, to deepen impression, the solemn question of the 17th is in substance repeated under a different form: "And if the righteous man is saved with difficulty,—the ungodly and sinful man, where shall he appear?" As so often, the apostle avails himself of LXX. language to express his thought. From εἰ to the end, the verse coincides *verbatim* with Prov. xi. 31, except that Peter omits the particle μέν before δίκαιος. The rendering from the Hebrew is somewhat free,—the exact sense being as given in the English Version, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more (how much more, R. V.) the wicked and the sinner." At first sight it might appear that in the first clause the LXX. has missed the meaning altogether. On consideration, however, it will be seen that, since "the righteous," so long as he is in this world, has his righteousness shaded by sin, there is a certain ambiguity in "recompensed;" and, on the whole, from the character of the sentence it seems probable that the LXX. is substantially correct; cf. Delitzsch, *in loc.* Luther similarly renders, *So der Gerechte auf Erden leiden muss.* The settlement of this exegetical question, however, is immaterial, so far as regards the use of the LXX. rendering by Peter; because the apostle is not appealing to the O. T. in support of his position, but simply adopting words familiar to him and probably to his readers, which happened to be suitable for the clothing of his thought.

The precise force of μόλις here is "with difficulty;" cf. Acts xxvii. 7, 8, 16. This sense answers to the etymological connection of the word with μόλος (usually μῶλος), "moil, toil," just as the synonymous adverb μόγις is cognate with μόγος (Germ. *Mühe*), "toil, trouble." The expression does not at all suggest any uncertainty with respect to the ultimate salvation of all true believers, but simply intimates that God's

mode of bringing His people to their final rest in the fulness of salvation is through hard and painful discipline. Not merely is the gate strait, but the way also to which the gate admits; so that sometimes the believer, compassed with difficulties, becomes almost despondent, the fightings without having naturally accordant fears within. The rendering of μόλις here in the A. V., "scarcely," is not very happy, indeed almost misleading; and it seems singular that the Revisers have retained it.—Ἀσεβής means "devoid of reverence for God, ungodly, impious;" ἁμαρτωλός, according to its ordinary use (*e.g.* Mark viii. 38; John ix. 16; Jas. iv. 8), designates one who is "defiled with manifest sin." The connection of the two here implies plainly that from the first characteristic the second naturally follows. In 1 Tim. i. 9, also, these two words are placed together exactly as here, and in Jude 15 they stand together without a conjunction. — On ποῦ φανεῖται, cf. Ps. i. 4–6, v. 5. Every reader feels the peculiarly solemn effect produced by the apostle's form of expression,—an unanswered question.

Ver. 19. The practical conclusion here presented in the form of a precept is naturally taken in special connection with the two verses immediately preceding; yet, as the verse plainly closes a paragraph, other arguments which have been set forth in the paragraph may also be included in the basis on which the conclusion rests. "Wherefore, seeing that divine grace, whilst for ends of infinite kindness it sends trials on Christians, yet saves them from those immeasurably greater judgements which are to come on God's enemies,—and seeing that participation in Christ's sufferings is a proof of the presence of the Spirit of glory and of God,—let them also who suffer, because God wills it, commit their souls, with no less confidence and restfulness than those believers who for the time are preserved from suffering, to a faithful Creator,—remembering always that this surrender of their souls can have reality and efficiency only when it is surrounded with an atmosphere of well-doing."

On the construction, occasionally found in classical writers, and pretty frequent in N. T. (*e.g.* 1 Cor. iii. 21, xv. 58; Phil. ii. 12), of ὥστε with an imperative—a construction in which the particle, instead of its ordinary subordinative force, has the sense of "and so" (exactly the Latin *itaque*), "consequently"—cf. Jelf, § 867; Winer, p. 377; A. Buttmann, p. 243.—By some expositors it has been thought that καί belongs to ὥστε, "wherefore also;" but there is no reason for supposing a deviation here from the regular usage which joins καί to what *follows*. The thought set forth in the paraphrase above with respect to the two divisions of the apostle's readers, those who at the time were enduring persecution, and those who were free from it, sufficiently explains the words "also those who suffer,"—and enters here most naturally when we remember what has been said in the 12th verse regarding the likelihood that some of these were tending to despondency and unbelief, "thinking it strange" that they should be exposed to persecution.

The expression οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ is naturally taken as equivalent to "those who suffer because God wills it" (cf. Gal. i. 4), and as intended to bring up the thought which has been already presented in a similar connection (iii. 17), and which must be the basis of all reasonable comfort under affliction, that the trouble is not a product of blind chance—something thrusting itself, so to speak, from some alien clime into the well-ordered domain of divine administration (ὡς ξένου ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος, ver. 12)—but is appointed by God Himself. Other views of the sense of the combination here have been suggested,—"those who suffer in connection with (*i.e.* because of doing) the will of God," or "those who suffer with a spirit accordant with the will of God." It does not seem at all likely that, had the former of these thoughts been in the apostle's mind, he would have chosen the preposition κατά to express it,—a mode, to say the least, very obscure. Neither, perhaps, for the other thought would κατά be the most natural particle, but rather

πρός (Luke xii. 47). This latter view of the sense, moreover, gives the verb πάσχειν an ethical shade of meaning, not simply "to be subjected to suffering," but "to *bear* suffering,"—a sense which, though in all languages a tendency to this transition shows itself (as, for example, with ὑποφέρειν in Greek and "endure" in English), πάσχειν does not seem to have. These views of the meaning have, no doubt, been thought of in consequence of the fact that the category, "those who suffer because God wills it," appears to be indistinctive, seeing that the sufferings of the enemies of God, as well as of His friends, come upon them "because He wills it." But there is no real difficulty here. Throughout the whole section, and particularly from εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός in ver. 16, every reader carries with him the knowledge that it is specifically *suffering for Christ's sake* of which the apostle is speaking. The category is really simply "those—among you Christians—who suffer;" and "according to the will of God" is an additional thought, brought in, parenthetically almost, to show clearly the basis on which the precept of the verse rests. The apostle's meaning fully given is "Those among you who suffer,—and this, let these sufferers remember, because God wills that they should suffer."

By the apostle's use of the designation πιστῷ κτίστῃ we are reminded of the wide range of argument for comfort and spiritual strength over which Christians may and should expatiate. The stimulus and cheer which are afforded by contemplation of the *redemptive* aspect of the divine character and work are so abundant that many believers perhaps almost forget how much may be found also in the thought of God as Creator. "He made you: that assures you of His infinite power to sustain you. His purpose in making you was, like all His purposes, absolutely wise and good; those therefore who with simplicity give themselves up to His care may well feel confident that He will protect and bless them. Moreover, He has expressly declared this purpose of love, pledging Himself by innumerable promises in His word; and no

promise of the all-truthful One can remain unfulfilled. To your Creator, then, faithful to His purpose and to all His declarations, commit your souls with childlike trust." "Conservare et volet ut fidelissimus, et poterit ut potentissimus" (Gerhard). Cf. Ps. xcv. 3–7, c. 3, 4; Acts iv. 24; and on πιστός in particular, 1 Cor. x. 13. The omission of the article with πιστῷ κτίστῃ makes the argument which is involved in the words stand out all the more distinctly,—as we too feel in using the indefinite article in such a case as the present, "to a faithful Creator;" on this anarthrousness, somewhat of a favourite structure with the apostle, cf. i. 10, note on προφῆται.

In παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν there is probably a reminiscence of the words of our Lord on the cross (Luke xxiii. 46), which themselves were a reminiscence of Ps. xxxi. 6. On παρατίθεσθαι, cf. also Acts xiv. 23, xx. 32. By the specification of τὰς ψυχάς (where plainly, and this in accordance with the apostle's general use of the word, ψυχή is to be taken in its loftiest and most comprehensive sense,—cf. i. 9, 22, ii. 11, 25), instead of simply "themselves," there is naturally suggested the thought that in the interests of their spiritual welfare much *bodily* suffering might still be before them, and, it might be, a martyr's death. Meantime the ψυχαί, placed in God's keeping, would be absolutely safe, and through the sufferings of the body would grow in beauty and energy.

Through the emphasis which their position gives them the words ἐν ἀγαθοποιΐᾳ have a marked incisiveness. It is as if the apostle said, "And remember that only holiness of character, faithful and persistent well-doing, can prove that any supposed surrender of the soul to God is sincere and full. If, having, as you imagine, made such a surrender, you proceed to act towards your persecutors as the men of the world would do, returning evil for evil,—or if in any way you regard iniquity in your heart, or practise it in your life,—your alleged surrender has no meaning or force." "Hæc una

patientium cura,—bene et agere et pati: cætera curabit Ille" (Bengel). The probable force of the preposition ἐν here is the semi-local, of element or atmosphere, as exhibited in the paraphrase above. On ἀγαθοποιία, cf. ἀγαθοποιεῖν, ii. 15, 20, iii. 6, 17, and ἀγαθοποιός, ii. 14. The noun ἀγαθοποιία itself occurs here only in N. T., and is found but rarely elsewhere; cf. Clem. Rom. §§ 2, 33, 34.

CHAPTER V.

Vv. 1–4. *Counsels to Elders.*

Returning from the somewhat episodical line of remark which has occupied the passage extending from iv. 12 to the end of that chapter, and which was apparently suggested by the doxology immediately preceding, the apostle resumes that series of injunctions with regard to duties arising out of Church relations, on which he had been engaged in iv. 7–11. He speaks first of the duties of elders. *Πρεσβύτεροι* or *ἐπίσκοποι*—for the names are used in N. T. exchangeably—seem to have been the only officers regarded as essential to the full organization of a church; cf. Acts xiv. 23; Tit. i. 5. The office of deacon, whilst also reckoned of much importance, was yet subsidiary. We have no account of the institution of the eldership. The office and the name alike appear to have come over from the arrangements of the synagogue; and thus at the first mention of elders in the history of the Christian Church (Acts xi. 30) we find the office assumed as existing simply as a matter of course.

Ver. 1. The connection intimated by *οὖν* seems to be with the closing words of the previous verse, *ἐν ἀγαθοποιΐᾳ*, to which, as has been seen, their position gives a special emphasis. The line of thought appears to run on thus: "In well-doing,—each in his allotted sphere of action; and first then of the elders."—The anarthrousness of *πρεσβυτέρους* accords with the apostle's general style. The attaching of *ἐν ὑμῖν* immediately to *πρεσβυτέρους* is grammatically a somewhat lax mode of expression, —offended by which many copyists have inserted *τούς*,—but

the combination is perfectly intelligible, "elders among you," "persons among you who are elders."

Considering those claims to the possession of a right of dictating to elders which have been based on an asserted succession to the Apostle Peter, and the style in which the assumed authority has often been exercised, it is particularly interesting to mark the gentleness and humility of the apostle's own mode of dealing. Like Paul (Philem. 9), he "might have been much bold in Christ to enjoin,"—"but, for love's sake, he rather," like him, says, παρακαλῶ. In support of his exhortation, too, he uses a designation which sets him in the position of one of themselves, their "fellow-elder"—one who personally felt the responsibilities, and from experience knew the difficulties, of an elder. While the apostleship was an office of far higher dignity and far wider influence than that which was held by those brethren who are now addressed, yet essentially its grand function was that of the eldership which Peter goes on to describe, "to feed the flock of God." The compound συνπρεσβύτερος occurs in N. T. here only; but we have substantially the same form of apostolic thought and feeling in the use of the simple πρεσβύτερος, 2 John 1 and 3 John 1. For the construction, exemplified here in ὁ συνπρεσβύτερος κτλ., of apposition to an unexpressed pronoun, cf. Heb. iv. 3; 1 John v. 13. In the cases of this kind which occur in N. T. the apposition is usually, as in these passages referred to, a participial combination taking the place of a relative clause. This is really the construction in our present passage also, for the structure of the whole verse shows that the apostle's thought was ὁ συνπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς (ὢν) κτλ., "I who am a fellow-elder and witness."

Of the precise meaning of the description of himself which the apostle adds to συνπρεσβύτερος, two somewhat different views may be taken. The word μάρτυς—apparently cognate with Lat. *me-mor*—has as its primary force "one who, recalling something seen or heard, attests it:" thus often in N. T. It came very naturally to be used among the Christians sometimes

with a special application to those who "bore testimony" to Christ as their Saviour and Lord by enduring for His sake suffering and death; so, for example, in Acts xxii. 20; Rev. ii. 13. This latter sense became the prevalent one in ecclesiastical use, and is thus that in which the word "martyr" is preserved in modern tongues. If the designation of himself here given by the apostle be looked at apart from the others with which it is associated, no one would doubt that he employs μάρτυς in the general sense. He had personally known the Lord, and his chief function as an apostle was to bear witness to what he had seen of Him (Acts i. 8, 22). Taken thus, the word reminds the reader in a gentle and unobtrusive way of the writer's apostolic authority,—"fellow-elder," no doubt, but more. But the designation which follows, ὁ καὶ τῆς δόξης κοινωνός, naturally suggests the question whether, in here calling himself μάρτυς κτλ., Peter does not intend a thought directly antithetic to that other,—something in the line of that special application mentioned above. He may be supposed to describe himself as "one who attested the sufferings of Christ" by participating in such sufferings, "always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus" (2 Cor. iv. 10), and thus to the spiritually-minded representing and recalling the Lord's sufferings. To some excellent interpreters this view of the meaning has commended itself, either along with the usual reference of "witnessing" (as Bengel, Wiesinger, Huther), or even excluding it entirely (as Calvin). Considering the want of analogies to such a use of μάρτυς when construed as here,—and the readiness at hand, if such had been the idea immediately before the apostle's mind, of κοινωνός (used in the next clause) to attach itself to παθημάτων as freely as to δόξης (cf. iv. 13), and express without ambiguity the essence of the thought,—there is good reason to question whether the special force of "a witness through suffering" was that which was primarily intended. At the same time, the other two designations having a reference to what was *common* to the apostle with

those whom he addresses, and this one being linked closely to *συνπρεσβύτερος* by their having but one article, it can hardly be doubted that Peter meant to *suggest* also the special reference. In a letter which is addressed to Christians under persecution, and in which but a few sentences before (iv. 13) the relation between participation in the Saviour's sufferings and participation in His glory had been explicitly set forth, mention of these sufferings such as we have here, followed immediately by mention of sharing in the glory, could not but give *μάρτυς* in a secondary way something of the sense of "witness through suffering."

The apostle's third designation of himself has naturally, seeing that it brings in a contrast, a separate article. It may seem that if we apply rigid exactness of construction we should have to take *ἐσόμενος* as the participial supplement here. But the apostle's thought is, no doubt, really richer than that supplement would allow. The *ὤν* which belongs in thought to the first clause is carried forward,—"who *am*"—in that vivid, joyful anticipation of faith which is "the substance of things hoped for;" so rightly R. E. V., "who am also a partaker." The apostle wishes his brethren—sharers with him in tribulation for Christ's sake—to be sharers also in this gladsome and sustaining energy of "living hope." He would have them look not around only, but forward and up. Peter had no doubt assurances from the Lord with regard to coming glory, which were specially for the apostles (as Luke xxii. 30), or even made particularly to himself (John xiii. 36); but in the present connection his mind, we may feel convinced, was resting mainly on those promises of glory which were spoken directly of all Christ's people (as John xvii. 20–24).—On *τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης*, cf. i. 5, note.

Ver. 2. The apostle's injunction to the elders to care for those entrusted to them is couched under the figure so common both in O. T. and N. T., and which has passed into common language in the official name "pastor;" cf. ii. 25, with note. *Ποιμαίνειν* is — in accordance with its probable derivation

from the root (Sanscr.) *pa*, "protect" (Curtius, *Gr. Etym.* § 372)—a word of much wider reference than *βόσκειν*; cf. Ps. xxiii. 1, *Κύριος ποιμαίνει με*, and see Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 25. It comprehends all the departments of a shepherd's work, quaintly summed up by Alford as "leading, feeding, heeding," and in English best set forth by the word "tend." By the special sharpness and energy of the aorist imperative, the injunction calls upon the elders to have their official life as a unity characterized by the spirit of devotion to service; on this striking use of the aorist, sometimes also in the indicative, compare ii. 22, note on *ἐποίησεν*. On the formation, prevalent in the later Greek, of the first aorist in *-ανα* from verbs in *-αινω*, cf. A. Buttmann, p. 41.—The dignity, and at the same time the solemn responsibilities connected with the office and work of spiritual "shepherds," are impressively illustrated by the addition to *ποίμνιον* of *τοῦ Θεοῦ* (cf. Ps. c. 3; Isa. xl. 11).—On the substance and form of the whole of the present injunction, cf. particularly Paul's words in Acts xx. 28, 29,—words addressed in all likelihood to some of those very elders to whom Peter here writes.

The words *τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν* have by some (so A. E. V. marg.) been taken adverbially, attached to *ποιμάνατε*, "as much as in you is;" cf. *τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν*, Rom. xii. 18, and perhaps also *τὸ κατ' ἐμέ*, Rom. i. 15. It does not appear at all probable that the apostle would append to a precept like the present a weakening expression such as this,—especially when we recall the absolute form in which the same commission had been given by the Lord to Peter himself (John xxi. 16), a form which, there can be little doubt, was in his mind when he wrote the words before us. Taking *τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον* together, the sense has been supposed to be "the flock entrusted to you," on the analogy of the combination *εἶναι* or *κεῖσθαι ἔν τινι*, "to depend on some one." Substantially, no doubt, the meaning is something of this kind, but to find the sense of "depend on" in *ἐν* alone is forced. With the echo of the quite unambiguous *ἐν ὑμῖν* of ver. 1 still

lingering on the ear, there is good reason to take ἐν ὑμῖν here also with the same meaning, that which *prima facie* presents itself to every reader,—"the flock of God which is among you" being a free but perfectly natural and intelligible mode of saying what is yet more expressly indicated by the plural κλήρων in ver. 3, "those portions of the flock that live in your districts, and are thus under your care." Indeed, the fact that in both verses the apostle's mode of expression is ἐν ὑμῖν, seems to show it as a thought lying in his mind,—whether the words were definitely intended to suggest it or not,—that whilst, as is fully recognised, the elders were in certain respects "over" the private members, yet the most important relation, claiming to be constantly remembered by both, was that which is represented by "in, among,"—"members one of another" (Rom. xii. 5); cf. Acts xx. 28, ἐν ᾧ.

Whether ἐπισκοποῦντες be read or left out does not substantially affect the sense. The adverbs connect themselves quite as naturally with the main verb ποιμάνατε. Supposing the word to belong to the text, the same uncertainty presents itself here as in ii. 25 (where see note) with respect to the precise point of view,—whether the primary sense referring to the shepherd, or the secondary with the official application, is prominent in the writer's mind,—"exercising the oversight" (which belongs to you as shepherds), or "exercising your functions as bishops."

The apostle's precept enters into detail with respect to the mode of "tending the flock," giving three particular injunctions, each of these in both a negative and a positive form. Looking at the first two positive statements, we find that there is an advance on one line from simple "willingness" to "zeal." Seeing, however, that when we turn to the negatives we find nothing of this kind, but faults which belong to distinct categories named,—and this in language so definite as naturally to fix a specific reference for the somewhat general positive terms in the antithesis,—it seems clear that the apostle's

course of thought is not climactic, or at all events is such only in a secondary way. The three vicious modes of pastoral dealing which Peter forbids—and which throughout the history of the Church have wrought incalculable injury to the character and influence of a vast number of her office-bearers—are, *first*, mere formal work, without true heartiness, the work of men whom some kind of social pressure or other simply external power has forced into a service which they dislike; *secondly*, work done merely, or mainly, for pecuniary gain; *thirdly*, work done in a spirit of personal arrogance. With the first fault is placed in contrast the sincere "willingness" of the man who loves his Saviour, and longs to serve Him. On this whole clause compare as an interesting commentary (though the reference there is not exactly to pastoral work) Philem. 14.

A moment's consideration shows that there is no contradiction between Peter's *μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς* and Paul's *ἀνάγκη μοι ἐπίκειται* in 1 Cor. ix. 16,—seeing that with Paul the "necessity" was that which sprang from a recognition of the will of Christ, to which the apostle's own will joyfully assented. It is obvious that in the measure in which *this ἀνάγκη* is felt will really be the efficiency of the discharge of pastoral duty. —The probable reading *κατὰ Θεόν* forms a striking and beautiful close to the first of these clauses of detail. The preposition seems to be best taken here with its familiar force of indicating a standard or model (cf. i. 15, iv. 6; Eph. iv. 24),—"exercising the oversight not by constraint, but willingly, like God," or "as God does" (iii. 12). The meaning may also be (cf. Rom. viii. 27; 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10, 11), "in accordance with the will of God." In Cranmer's English Version these words have been inserted, in a somewhat hesitating way marked by the mode of printing, and in the form "after a godly sorte."

With the second wrong mode of procedure mentioned—namely, acting as elders from love of money—is contrasted the "hearty readiness, alacrity" (cf. Rom. i. 15; 2 Cor.

viii. 11, 12), which has its impulse not from the consideration of anything belonging only to this world, but from the energies of the new life in Christ ("ut fructus non sit merces, sed pastura," Bengel). In μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς there is manifestly nothing opposed to the ordinance "that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 14). The apostle's reference is expressly to "*base* gain." Now the payment made by his people to a pastor whose heart is in his work is not base gain, but the very reverse, a most honourable support. On the other hand, from the essentially spiritual objects of office in the Church of Christ, the payment made to a pastor who holds his office solely, or mainly, that he may obtain this, becomes in his case "filthy lucre," "wages of unrighteousness." The adverb αἰσχροκερδῶς, "from, or in the spirit of, desire for base gain," is not found elsewhere; but the adjective occurs both in classical writers and in N. T. (1 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 7; cf. also Tit. i. 11).

Ver. 3. The sentence passes here into a participial form, the participles, like the adverbs, describing a right and a wrong spirit and manner of "tending the flock of God." Κατακυριεύοντες is by some (as Huther) taken to involve that idea of hostility or oppressiveness which κατά gives in many compounds, "tyrannizing over." But this view of the force of the word does not seem to be supported either by the usage of LXX. or N. T. The verb is generally employed, according to another familiar use of κατά in composition, as simply a somewhat strengthened form for κυριεύω. In LXX. it is applied as freely to gracious government—see Jer. iii. 14; Ps. lxxii. (lxxi. Sept.) 8—as to oppressive—Ps. x. 10 (ix. 30, Sept.), cxix. (cxviii.) 133. In N. T. the verb is found in three places besides the present. To the statements in Matt. xx. 25, Mark x. 42, where it occurs, an exact parallel in our Lord's teaching is recorded by Luke (xxii. 25) in connection with a different incident, and there we have the simple κυριεύω. In Acts xix. 16, again, the word means "to master, overcome," according to a frequent LXX. use in places where

quite manifestly no idea of reproach is intended. — The precise meaning in our passage of *τῶν κλήρων* also, "the lots, allotments," has been debated. The view set forth in Wycliffe's rendering, "nether as havynge lordschip in the clergie," after the Vulgate *in cleris*, is an anachronism. This use of the word, no doubt, originated early (Tertullian has it, and not as being new), but it has no support in N. T. In the present passage, moreover, in which only the "elders" and "the flock of God" as a whole are mentioned, and which is plainly directly addressed to *all* the elders, such a reference would be out of place and inconsistent. The interpretation followed in the Geneva English Version, and adopted by the Authorized, "God's heritage," exhibits a thought in itself true and beautiful. The spiritual Israel might well be called, as ancient Israel is called again and again, the "lot, portion, heritage" of God, *κλῆρος* (Deut. ix. 29), *κληρονομία* (Isa. xix. 25), *μερὶς καὶ σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας* (Deut. xxxii. 9). This thought is indeed very nearly the same as that set forth by Peter in ii. 9, *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν*. But in our passage the absence of *Θεοῦ*, and the use of the plural,—which with *κλῆρος*, applied in the way under consideration, seems to have no analogy, God's people forming one heritage,—are strong and apparently decisive objections to our accepting this as the intended sense. The probable reference is to the various congregations, as "allotted" by God in His providential arrangements to different groups of the elders; so Tyndale, "not as though ye were lordes over the parisshes;" and R. V., "neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you" (in which "charges" would surely have been better). This use of *κλῆρος*, though not found elsewhere in N. T., is in itself perfectly accordant with the meaning of the word. If *προσεκληρώθησαν* in Acts xvii. 4 be taken as passive in meaning, "were allotted" (as portion, or fruit of ministry), a close parallel to our passage presents itself; but the sense is not improbably middle, "cast in their lot with, consorted with." —According to the results of our examination of the separate

words then, the meaning of the clause appears to be, "not as exercising lordship over your allotments." With regard to this point of duty, cf. Matt. xx. 25–28; 2 Cor. i. 24.

On the positive side, the direct antithesis would be "but as counting yourselves their servants for Jesus' sake" (2 Cor. iv. 5). Implying this, the apostle prefers, instead of stating the duty in this general form, to specify the great mode in which they will show themselves wise servants of their brethren, living for their help,—"but becoming"—growing ever more fully by thoughtfulness, prayerfulness, and definite effort—"the flock's ensamples." On the force of *γίνεσθαι* in ethical advices to Christians, see iii. 13, note. On *τύποι*, as here used, cf. Phil. iii. 17; 1 Thess. i. 7.

Ver. 4. Promise of a rich reward to the elder who has faithfully tended the flock of God. Whilst in every age of the Church Christ's servants find thought of the reward to be needful and stimulating, it is obvious that in times of persecution, such as the time in which this Epistle was written, elders, exposed by their prominent position to peculiar hostility and danger, have for that reason peculiar need to look up from the cross to the crown.

For *καί* used, as frequently, with what is sometimes called a "consecutive" force, "and so," cf. *e.g.* Matt. xxiii. 32; Phil. iv. 7, 9: on Phil. iv. 12, Ellicott has an excellent note on the various uses of this conjunction.—The verb *φανερουῦσθαι*, here used of the Lord's Second Coming, has been employed by the apostle elsewhere (i. 20) of the Incarnation. John also has the word with both references,—to the Incarnation, 1 John iii. 5, 8; to the Second Coming, 1 John ii. 28, iii. 2. For the present application, cf. also Col. iii. 4.—The word *ἀρχιποίμην* is not found in classical writers, and occurs in N. T. here only; but cf. ii. 25; Heb. xiii. 20.—The so-called Attic future of verbs in *-ίζω* (Jelf, § 203), as here *κομιεῖσθε*, is not uncommon in N. T.; *e.g.* *ἀφοριοῦσιν*, Matt. xiii. 49; *ἐλπιοῦσιν*, Rom. xv. 12. Of *κομίζομαι* the future in *-ίσομαι* also occurs, Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 25: see Westcott and Hort's

Gr. Test. App. p. 163.—On the "crown of glory," cf. "crown of life," Jas. i. 12; Rev. ii. 10; "crown of righteousness," 2 Tim. iv. 8. In all these cases the genitive is one of apposition,—the "glory," "life," "righteousness," being itself the "crown." The glory is (cf. ver. 10) participation in the communicable glory of the Redeemer—Himself δόξῃ ἐστεφανωμένον, Heb. ii. 9.—To take ἀμαράντινος as simply another form for ἀμάραντος (i. 4) yields a satisfying sense, "the unfading crown (garland) of glory." It is to be observed, however, that both of these words, which do not occur elsewhere in N. T., are also rare in secular literature; and the fact that, using a rare word twice in his short letter, the apostle has two forms, suggests as likely that the two were not thought of by him as being quite equivalent in meaning. Now there is evidence that ἀμάραντος was used substantively, to designate an imagined unwithering flower; and in the form *amaranthus* the name has been received into scientific botany as that of a genus of plants which long retain their freshness. From the substantive ἀμάραντος is, by the usual termination indicating material, regularly formed ἀμαράντινος, "made of amaranth, amaranthine,"—as ξύλινος, "wooden;" ῥόδινος, "made of roses;" ἀκάνθινος, "made of thorns" (John xix. 5). Thus we seem to have here really a passing poetic reference to the garden of the heavenly paradise; and evidently from our passage, regarded in this light, Milton has obtained the suggestion of his exquisite lines, *Paradise Lost*, iii. 353–356. Cf. also Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* ii. 8, ὁ καλὸς τοῦ ἀμαράντου στέφανος ἀπόκειται τοῖς καλῶς πεπολιτευμένοις. To the mind of every Christian reader the thought of the στέφανος ἀμαράντινος which the grace of our Lord gives to us, suggests at once the remembrance of the στέφανος ἀκάνθινος which our sin gave to Him.

A question has been raised with regard to the exact reference and shade of meaning intended by Peter in using the image of a "crown." Is this crown the emblem of kingly dignity,—or of honour for victory in struggle—the garland

at the Greek games,—or of festal gladness—the garland worn at entertainments sometimes among the Jews (Isa. xxviii. 1 ; Prov. i. 9, iv. 9 ; Wisd. ii. 8 ; Ecclus. i. 11), as well as among the Greeks and Romans ? The στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς of Rev. ii. 10 is not improbably a royal crown ; for, as that book seems to move throughout in the circle of *Hebrew* imagery, an allusion to the games of the heathen is unlikely ; and in chap. iv. 4, 10, στέφανος appears almost certainly to designate a royal crown (cf. Trench, *Comm. on Epistles to the Seven Churches*, on ii. 10). In Jas. i. 12, also, the same expression may naturally enough—and, when we remember the markedly O. T. tone of thought characteristic of that Epistle, may with likelihood—be regarded as meaning either a kingly crown or the festal wreath. In the place before us, however, neither the royal nor the festal reference is suitable. The floral allusion which seems to be distinctly present in ἀμαράντινος shows Peter's thought not to be of a diadem, but of a garland ; and the connection suggests certainly the idea of reward of successful effort rather than that of festal joy. It seems natural, therefore, to regard him as having had in his mind the wreath of victory at the games. Looking at Peter's obvious familiarity with the Epistles of Paul, in which these contests and their rewards are often referred to, and at the fact that he was writing to Christians living in a region where everything connected with such games was very well known, there is no difficulty in admitting that this is his thought here.

Ver. 5. *On the duty of the younger people in relation to their elders, coupled with an injunction of humility of spirit on all, elder and younger alike.*

On ὁμοίως used of correlation, cf. iii. 7, note. In the present case the word is specially suitable, seeing that (as Bengel observes) humility has been set forth (ver. 3) as the

proper spirit of the ruling members of the congregation, as well as, here, of the ruled. It is obvious that πρεσβυτέροις here has, at least primarily, the same reference as πρεσβυτέρους in ver. 1, which, beyond question, is to office-bearers. To take the word in the present verse as not also having this sense in the foreground is wholly unnatural, and, in particular, would remove from ὁμοίως all relevancy. Who, then, are the νεώτεροι? There does not seem to be likelihood in the view of Weiss, that the reference in this word is to a special class of officials in the Church, set apart for the discharge of duties requiring physical strength, and spoken of in Acts v. 6 (νεώτεροι), 10 (νεανίσκοι), as performing such duties. Such a class of officers is not mentioned elsewhere; and the variation of designation in the verses in Acts seems to indicate that the explanation which probably presents itself first to every reader of that passage is the true one,—namely, that the younger members of the company at once instinctively took upon them a work which naturally fell to them. Seeing, moreover, that the apostle's previous injunction spoke of the duties of elders to the whole body of those placed under their charge, the correlation marked by ὁμοίως leads one to think here of an address to the Church members generally,—not specially to a certain class of officials, however pointedly correlative the names πρεσβύτεροι and νεώτεροι might in themselves seem. Many expositors accordingly think of all the non-official members of the various congregations—all those members who were not officially πρεσβύτεροι—as being intended by νεώτεροι. This, however, would not accord with the recognised sense of the word, except on the supposition, which we have no reason whatever to regard as well founded, that *all* the older members of Christian Churches were in the first age chosen to be also officially "elders."

The most satisfactory explanation of the verse appears to be afforded by considering the reference in πρεσβυτέροις to the office-bearers to be, whilst the primary, not the sole one. That experience given by age which—as in γερουσία, *senatus*,

"alderman," and the like—the name πρεσβύτερος suggests as an important element of qualification for office, was, it is reasonable to think, actually present as a rule among the eldership of the primitive Church; and one can easily understand how, in giving an injunction to the congregations to show deference to those elderly men among them who were officially "elders," the apostle might almost unconsciously class with these the other elderly members, and might thus address his injunction directly to the "younger people." An objection to this view has been based on the fact that what Peter enjoins is not "deference," but "submission," which appears to imply official subordination. But if the official elders were *primarily* in the apostle's mind, this seems sufficient to explain his using ὑποτάγητε; and the force of that word—one sometimes of wide reference (cf. Eph. v. 21)—shades into something more general in relation to other elderly people. Precisely the same implicit transition from the special to a general use of πρεσβύτεροι seems to present itself in Polyc. §§ 5, 6. In Clem. Rom. also (§§ 1, 21) there is something similar,—ambiguity, however, being present here, so that Harnack, for example, thinks official elders to be spoken of, whilst other editors exclude this reference. It is obvious that in English, in the same way, an injunction addressed to the younger members of a Presbyterian congregation to "honour their elders" might be of doubtful or double reference. In 1 Tim. v. 1, 2, it seems plain from the structure of the sentence that in πρεσβυτέρῳ *age* alone is referred to: cf. the parallel in Tit. ii. 2, 3, where the words are πρεσβῦται and πρεσβύτιδες.—On the use of the passive aorist ὑποτάγητε with a middle force, cf. ii. 13.—On the duty here enjoined, in its special reference, cf. Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 17; in its general reference, Lev. xix. 32.

The second part of the verse might almost claim to be placed in a section by itself. The particle δέ, however, according to its use here, links the new precept so closely to that just given that it is perhaps best grouped with it. As

often, δέ has something of a corrective force, which may be paraphrased thus: "But why give a series of detailed precepts, when one injunction really suffices, if prayerfully pondered, to guide you aright in your relations to each other?" "Yea," of both A. and R. V., is an excellent rendering.

Two constructions are possible for the dative ἀλλήλοις. The first part of the verse may run on to and include this word, in which case it is governed by ὑποτάγητε understood. —"Likewise, ye younger, be subject to your elders; yea, all of you (be subject) to one another." The precept given according to this arrangement has abundant analogies, as Rom. xii. 10, Phil. ii. 3, and has a verbal parallel in Eph. v. 21. The transition from the *kind* of ὑποταγή due to office-bearers to that due generally by one believer to another may seem abrupt; yet there is scarcely in this a ground of objection to the construction, seeing that, according to what appears to be the most likely view of the sense of the first clause of the verse, there has already been a certain widening out of the reference of ὑποτάγητε. An objection, however, does present itself in the fact that the following sentence would begin without a connective particle. Such a structure is not without parallel in the Epistle where a new *paragraph* begins (*e.g.* i. 22, ii. 13); but with the sequence of thought so close as it appears to be here, the want of a conjunction seems not to be natural. So unnatural, indeed, does this appear, that if—all things being taken into account—the construction under discussion were deemed the true one, there would be fair reason for deciding to begin a new paragraph with τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην, severing the injunction to humility from all reference to the preceding precept. In that case πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις would certainly be an abrupt mode of closing a paragraph. On the whole, the other division of the words appears to be preferable, according to which the new sentence begins with πάντες. In this case, ἀλλήλοις associates itself with ἐγκομβώσασθε, with that wider force of the dative of advantage which is often

found in N. T. (cf. ii. 24, note), "for, in relation to, one another." On "all," elder and younger people alike, the apostle enjoins "humility." That lowly opinion of one's own character and deserts which is given by candid self-scrutiny in the light of God's revelation, conjoined—as true Christian humility always is—with the disposition to think the best that is possible of others, is the secret of "sweet reasonableness" and pleasant helpfulness in all the relations of life; and the prevalence of this spirit in the Church would evidently secure concord and happiness, and show to the world the heavenliness of Christianity. On ταπεινοφροσύνη, cf. iii. 8, note.

The verb ἐγκομβοῦσθαι occurs in N. T. here only, and but seldom in Greek literature. It was not employed by Attic writers, and—judging from the nationality of the first who are known to have used it, Epicharmus and Apollodorus of Gela—appears to have been originally a Sicilian provincialism. The meaning of the verb and its cognates has been largely discussed, the fullest and best dissertations being by Gataker in his *Adversaria Miscellanea*, and by C. F. A. Fritzsche in *Fritzschiorum Opusc.* Κόμβος is "a band, a stripe of cloth used for a fastening:" hence ἐγκομβοῦσθαι, "to fasten or gird on one's self." To the interpretation adopted by some (as A. E. V.), which makes Peter's precept here *exactly* equivalent to Paul's in Col. iii. 12, ἐνδύσασθε ταπεινοφροσύνην, "put on humility (as a garment)," Fritzsche's objection appears insuperable, "Si nihil aliud nisi hoc Petrus dicere voluisset, mirum videri quod verbum tam insolens ἐγκομβώσασθε quam simplex et in hac re usitatum ἐνδύσασθε ponere maluerit." Feeling this, many expositors have added, as naturally suggested by the force of κόμβος, the idea of *firmness*, "bind upon you:" so Bengel, "induite vos et involvite, ut amictus humilitatis nulla vi vobis detrahi possit." But by the way in which the substantive ἐγκόμβωμα was used, other aspects of the meaning of the verb are suggested as at least possible. This name was given to a white scarf or apron, usually worn by slaves,

and regarded as a mark of their condition,—also, however, worn sometimes by children belonging to other ranks of life. Now, by his examination of the passages in which the *verb* occurs, Fritzsche seems to make out pretty clearly that in use, instead of its primary generality of sense, it took up into its meaning, frequently at least, the special force of its derivative noun, signifying therefore "encomboma sibi incingere." Accordingly, applying the servile reference, Fritzsche, following Heinsius, translates our passage, "Omnes autem lubenter alter alteri cedentes modestiam vobis pro servorum encombomate incingite," and paraphrases thus, "declarant servi implicato encombomate se heris obnoxios esse,—ita vos omnes alterum alteri obnoxium esse sumpta modestia ostendite." Gataker again, applying the case of the occasional use of the *encomboma* by free-born young people, brings in the idea of adornment, translating thus, "Humilitatem induite, ut encombomata virgines ingenuæ,—quibus," as he goes on in explanation, "se decore vestitas exhibebant, ubi in hominum conspectum prodibant." Among the three specialties which may thus be thought of as attaching themselves in this verb to the simple idea of "putting on,"—viz. "firmly," "for adornment," "for service to others," preference appears decidedly due to the last, for the following reasons. *First*, the prevalence of the wearing of the *encomboma* by slaves was much more likely to suggest this as an element in any figurative application than the occasional use of the garment by free children. *Secondly*, as a feature in the representation, this is specially suitable to the particular grace here spoken of, humility. *Thirdly*, the construction of the verb with the dative ἀλλήλοις suggests that in the writer's mind there associated itself with ἐγκομβοῦσθαι some definite thought of tendency or action *towards*—such as is well brought out by the rendering given in R. E. V., "gird yourselves with humility *to serve* one another." Regarded in this light, the word was obviously fitted to bring up before the heart with much vividness the supreme example of humility, through recalling that amazing

scene when the Son of God, about to do the work of a servant, "took a towel and girded Himself."

In the last clause of the verse the apostle brings forward a strong ground for "putting on as servants the garment of humility," in the form of a citation from Prov. iii. 34, "Because God resisteth—setteth Himself as a warrior in array against—the proud, but giveth grace to the humble." For a poetical expansion of this thought, see Mary's Song, Luke i. 51–53. In the connection in which Peter has this passage, the arrogant bearing towards fellow-men which is prompted by the pride of an unrenewed heart, and the meekness and kindness towards fellow-men which spring from Christian humility, are primarily suggested by *ὑπερηφάνοις* and *ταπεινοῖς* respectively. At the same time, the aspects of these states of heart directly towards God present themselves immediately to thought also, and in *ταπεινώθητε κτλ.* of the next verse these aspects come evidently into the foreground. On the precise meaning of *ὑπερήφανος*, which makes this adjective specially suitable in the connection in which the apostle sets it here ("superbus cum aliorum contemptu et contumelia," Tittmann), cf. Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 29, and Westcott on 1 John ii. 16, note on *ἀλαζονία*.

The passage is cited by Peter exactly as in LXX., except that for *Κύριος* he has *Θεός*, a substitution which is found also in the quotation as made by James (iv. 6). Clement of Rome, too (§ 30), and Ignatius (*Eph.* § 5), have *Θεός*.

Vv. 6–11. *Exhortation to restfulness of heart in God, conjoined with spiritual vigilance.*

Ver. 6. Some good interpreters (as Calvin and Bengel) would not begin a new paragraph here, but think that the subordination of the younger people to their elders, and of all, according to their varied relations, to each other, is still prominent in the apostle's mind, — the argument, on this

view, being that it is "God's mighty hand" which has instituted such distinctions as call for subjection. But the emphasis of the modes of expression, "the mighty hand" and "casting your anxiety," seems quite decidedly to show that that persecution for conscience' sake to which the apostle has referred so often in the Epistle, of which he has spoken with special fulness only a few verses before (iv. 12–19), and which he expressly mentions again immediately after (vv. 9, 10), constitutes the ground of his observations here also. He keeps still to the injunction of "humility," but (cf. note on ver. 5) turns here from the manward to the directly Godward aspect of this grace. He calls upon his Christian brethren to be so under the influence of a true knowledge of their personal unworthiness as patiently to bear the afflictions which God sends,—deeming it to be of His mercies that they are not consumed but chastened, and showing their consciousness, alike of their own helplessness and of God's goodness, by casting all their anxiety over upon Him.

"The hand of God" is a familiar O. T. expression (*e.g.* Ezra viii. 22, 31; Ps. xxxii. 4), and occurs a number of times with the attribute "mighty," *χεὶρ κραταιά*, LXX. (*e.g.* Deut. iii. 24; Job xxx. 21). The figure, designating simply the divine activity, obviously may be, and in fact is, applied either to dealings of mercy or of judgement, the context indicating the reference. In the present case, whilst, of course, the strength which can "exalt" when the fit time comes is suggested to the mind, yet plainly what is directly pointed to is afflictive discipline; and, by the sharp aorist imperative, the believers are called on to see that there be no delay in their "humbling themselves" under this discipline. The verb *ταπεινώθητε* was no doubt immediately suggested by *ταπεινοφροσύνην* and *ταπεινοῖς* of ver. 5,—*οὖν* indeed implying this, "seeing that God giveth grace to the humble." Compare also, however, in LXX. the last clause of Gen. xvi. 9, which, though speaking merely of human relations, has a curious resemblance to the present

clause, and may conceivably have been echoing in Peter's memory.

The conjunction *ἵνα* presents a thought which the apostle's mode of expression throughout the letter shows to have been specially familiar to him,—"Longing, as I know you are, to be glorified with Christ, prove, by a right spirit under suffering, your union to Him in cross-bearing now, *in order that* you may have union with Him in crown-wearing hereafter:" cf. iv. 13. No principle could well have been more familiar to the personal companions of our Lord than this: cf. Matt. xxiii. 12; Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14. 2 Cor. xi. 7 may also be compared for a different thought, presented in a very striking way by words somewhat similar to those employed here.—For *ἐν καιρῷ*, common in classical writers, "at the appointed time" ("not thy fancied time, but His own wisely-appointed time," Leighton), cf. Matt. xxiv. 45; Luke xii. 42. The apostle's main reference, as regards this *καιρός*, is doubtless to the Lord's Second Coming (cf. iv. 7),—not, however, to the exclusion of other seasons of deliverance which God may grant to His people. A considerable number of authorities add *ἐπισκοπῆς* to *καιρῷ*. This fills out what is no doubt the true meaning; but the word is in all likelihood a gloss from ii. 12 (on which see note).—For an interesting reference to this verse in the letter from the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, see Introd. § I. 2.

Ver. 7. The apostle here describes the manner in which the *ταπεινοῦσθαι* of ver. 6 will act,—clothing his thought, as so often, in an O. T. vesture. He turns into a participial form the precept with which Ps. lv. (liv., Sept.) 22 begins, *ἐπίρριψον ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου*; and the assurance also which follows in that verse, *καὶ αὐτός σε διαθρέψει, οὐ δώσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα σάλον τῷ δικαίῳ*, he gives in substance, though in wholly different phraseology,—presenting the statement, moreover, expressly as a ground of confidence, by the use of *ὅτι*. Christian humility leads to an entire discarding of trust in self, and to the casting, by the prayer of faith, of all the

soul's anxiety, with regard both to this world and the next, upon God,—and this from the knowledge that He cares for His people, and therefore will, in His providence, work in all things for their good, and by His grace bring them at last to glory. The word "casting," distinct from mere quiet "laying" or "placing," obviously implies difficulty and consequent energetic effort. On the precept, cf. Ps. xxxvii. 5; Matt. vi. 25; Phil. iv. 6. The aorist participle ἐπιρίψαντες is plainly, from its meaning, not conceived as antecedent in time to the main verb ταπεινώθητε, but coincident (cf. Mark xv. 30; Acts xxii. 16, 2nd cl.)—the construction being analogous to what is found so frequently in N. T., an aorist indicative and aorist participle coinciding in time: cf. Winer p. 430. In its connection, the participle has itself practically an imperative force,—the construction being, indeed, simply a formal change, in accordance with the structure of the sentence, from the Psalmist's ἐπίρριψον. On the spelling of ἐπιρίψαντες with one ρ,—which, in the best MSS. of N. T., is found also in a considerable number of other words that in classical prose have always the letter doubled, particularly, as here, compounds with prepositions,—cf. A. Buttmann, p. 32.

By employing both "care" and "careth" in this verse, the A. E. V., and older versions, give an appearance of verbal correspondence in the two clauses which does not accord with the original: compare the use of "conformed" and "transformed" in Rom. xii. 2. *Μέριμνα* is—in accordance with what (notwithstanding the doubts of some eminent philologists,—see Curtius, *Gr. Etym.* §§ 466, 467) may still be deemed the probable, as it is certainly the *prima facie*, connection of the word with μέρος, μερίζω — "*distracting* care, anxiety," such as may readily prevent us from "uniting the heart" to serve God, and tends to make a man δίψυχος (Jas. i. 8). Cf. Virgil's fine sketch, *Aen.* viii. 19–21. On μέριμνα and μεριμνάω, cf. Mark iv. 19; Matt. vi. 25, 28.

Wiesinger well remarks on the richness of the assurance implied in the fact that not ἵνα, but ὅτι, is the conjunction

by which the latter clause of the verse is attached to the former,—and on the emphasis given to this assurance by the arrangement of the pronouns, *αὐτῷ* (*μέλει*) being placed at the head of its clause to give immediate support to *ἐπ' αὐτόν* with which the other has ended. "Humble yourselves under the mighty hand, *because* that mighty hand obeys the behest of a Father's heart" (Besser). When heathenism in its higher flights approaches the Christian position of casting the soul's burden on God (as in M. Anton. iv. 31, *τὸ δὲ ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ βίου διέξελθε ὡς θεοῖς μὲν ἐπιτετροφὼς τὰ σεαυτοῦ πάντα ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς*), the most marked point of distinction from the sentiment as expressed in revelation is the total absence of that brightness of hope which springs from the knowledge that "He careth for us."—For *μέλει* construed with *περί* (as sometimes in classical writers), cf. Matt. xxii. 16; John x. 13,—which latter passage vividly illustrates the present by contrast; construed with the simple genitive, 1 Cor. ix. 9; with the nominative of the thing,—the construction in this place being doubtful, however,—Acts xviii. 17.

The first clause of this verse is repeatedly quoted by Hermas (*Vis.* iii. 11, iv. 2, *bis*),—probably, however, judging from the form of a clause appended on the third occasion, not from Peter, but from the Psalm.

Vv. 8, 9. The apostle's thought advances in a simple and natural way. The persecutions of earthly foes, and those anxieties which these persecutions were apt to excite, made it —even if the statement of the case ended there—a difficult thing to live the Christian life of patience and trust in God. But behind these troubles, and acting through them, was he who is by pre-eminence *the* enemy of God and God's people, the personal head of the kingdom of evil,—who is ever ranging the world, seeking to draw the children of light back into darkness, and thus destroy them. The Christian therefore must always be spiritually-minded and vigilant, and thus ready to resist the devil. Whilst casting all his solicitude on the Lord, he must remember at the same time, as perfectly

consistent with this, that God calls on His people to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling,"—to be not inert, but open-eyed and full of energy. "Whilst God careth for you, be ye sober, watch, resist,"—"*hæc vestra cura sit*" (Bengel).

Ver. 8. The verb *νήφειν* signifies a state of mind and heart unbeclouded by sensual influences: cf. i. 13, note. *Γρηγορεῖν*, being derived immediately from *ἐγρήγορα*, seems strictly to describe a waking state, looked on "as the effect of some arousing effort, and so a condition of alertness and watchfulness" (T. S. Green): for illustration of the N. T. force of this word, cf. particularly Mark xiii. 35–37. The same combination of verbs as here—in the inverse order, however,—occurs in 1 Thess. v. 6. The apostle's call to duty is given with marked energy and decision, indicated both by the use of the aorist imperative and by the absence of a conjunction. A suggestion of Besser is striking, and seems not improbable, that the particular injunction *γρηγορήσατε* may, in its connection here, have been brought into the apostle's mind by a remembrance of the command given to himself on an occasion which we may well believe to have never been very far away from his memory (Matt. xxvi. 40, 41).

In the correct reading, the second clause has no *ὅτι*; and there is a manifest gain in vigour of expression through the want of the particle in a place like this, where the nature of the connection is so obvious.—For *ἀντίδικος* used in its primary and ordinary classical sense, "an adversary at law," see Matt. v. 25; Luke xii. 58, xviii. 3. The secondary use, for "an enemy" generally, was poetical among the Greeks (as Æschyl. *Agam.* 41), and occurs here only in N. T., but is found sometimes in LXX.,—cf. 1 Sam. ii. 10; Isa. xli. 11. In the present case the word answers to the Hebrew שָׂטָן, not here, however, as a proper name, but a common noun, the defining name *διάβολος* following in apposition. On *ἀντίδικος*, as here employed, compare the use of *ὁ ἀντικείμενος* by Clem. Rom. § 51 (*ὁ ἀντικείμενος* of 1 Tim. v. 14 has also by Chrysostom and many other expositors been understood of

Satan, but improbably). The name διάβολος, when used of Satan, is seldom found without the article; hence some have been disposed to take as its article here that before ἀντίδικος, making ἀντίδικος an adjective, and translating the words "your opposing evil spirit" (so Bishop Middleton, *Gr. Art.* p. 431), or in some similar way. This is plainly far from natural, and there is no real need for deviating from the *prima facie* construction which takes διάβολος as in apposition to ἀντίδικος,—its anarthrousness being due to its being dealt with as a proper name, in the same way as often Θεός, Κύριος, and others; cf. Winer, p. 148 foll. See a similar anarthrous use of the word in Acts xiii. 10; Rev. xx. 2; cf. also cases of Σατανᾶς without its usual article, Mark iii. 23; Luke xxii. 3.

The comparison of the fury of the enemies of God's people to that of a wild beast is common in Scripture: cf. Ps. xvii. 12, xxii. 13; Ezek. xxii. 25. A reader not unnaturally thinks of this figure as having a somewhat special fitness in the present passage, after the representation in vv. 2, 3, of the godly as a "flock:" cf. John x. 12. The structure of the passage, however, hardly favours the view that the thought of the image of sheep is still in the apostle's mind: the call, νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε, has relevancy only as addressed to men. —The lion is "roaring" in the rage of hunger: ὠρυόμενος—κυρίως ἐπὶ λιμῷ κλαιόντων λύκων ἢ λεόντων ἢ κυνῶν (Hesychius). Cf. also, with regard to the use of the word, Judg. xiv. 5; Ps. xxii. (xxi., Sept.) 13, civ. (ciii.) 21; Zech. xi. 3.—On περιπατεῖ in its present connection, cf. Job i. 7, ii. 2.—If τινα belong to the text, it seems likely that the accentuation as an interrogative represents the thought which was in the apostle's mind rather than τινά—here somewhat flat and feeble. The form τίνα fits in perfectly with the current of the sentence. "The lion is roaming around your encampment in the wilderness, seeking to devour,—but which of the pilgrims? He can have real power only over those who through spiritual torpor fail to be strong in the Lord and

in the power of His might; wherefore, brethren, be sober, be watchful." *Ζητῶν τίνα καταπιεῖν* is a forcible and perfectly natural mixture of two constructions, *ζητῶν τίνα καταπιῇ*, "seeking whom he may devour" (cf. Luke xii. 29), and *ζητῶν τινὰ καταπιεῖν*, "seeking to devour some one." Copyists, according to their wont, attempted to straighten the construction by substituting the one or the other of these forms for Peter's; and, where *τινα* was taken to be the indefinite pronoun, its want of force easily led to its being sometimes omitted. Thus all the varieties of reading are accounted for.—For the secondary sense of *καταπίνω* found here, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 54; Heb. xi. 29; Ps. cxxiv. (cxxiii. Sept.) 3; Prov. i. 12; Jer. li. 34.

Ver. 9. On *ᾧ ἀντίστητε*, cf. Jas. iv. 7 (a passage which, from the marked resemblance of vv. 7, 8, 10 there to vv. 5–9 here, we can hardly doubt to have been in our apostle's mind), —also Eph. vi. 11 foll.—The dative *πίστει* is that familiar one of the sphere to which a general predicate is to be limited (Winer, p. 270),—"being firm, stable, in your faith" (Acts xvi. 5; Rom. iv. 20; Col. ii. 5, 7; and see the contrast, Eph. iv. 14).—For *εἰδότες*, "knowing as ye do," "seeing that ye know," cf. i. 18.

In the infinitive clause governed by *εἰδότες*, whilst the general sense is clear, the exact form of the thought is somewhat doubtful.—The use of *τὰ αὐτά*, as here, with so complete a substantive standing as to govern a genitive, seems to have no parallel. It is evident from the meaning of the clause that the force of *τὰ αὐτά* is not abstract (on the analogy of *τὸ χρηστόν* = *χρηστότης*, Rom. ii. 4, and the like), but concrete, *τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων* being substantially = *τὰ αὐτὰ παθήματα*. It seems as if the apostle, having it in his mind to say "close resemblances, counterparts, of your sufferings," suddenly, to bring out the similarity with intensity, substituted "the identical," "the self-same,"—but finished the construction as if he had said "counterparts."—The dative *ἀδελφότητι* may be governed by *τὰ αὐτά*, "the

same sufferings as (or, with) the brotherhood" (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 5); or it may be joined with ἐπιτελεῖσθαι as a *dat. comm.* of that somewhat general kind not uncommon in N. T. (cf. ἀλλήλοις, ver. 5), "for, on, with regard to, the brotherhood." The dative can hardly, according to N. T. usage (cf. Winer, p. 274, and particularly A. Buttmann, p. 187), be taken as that of the actor, for ὑπὸ τῆς ἀδελφότητος.—Of the verb ἐπιτελεῖν, the general N. T. use is with its primary force of bringing to an end something which has been enjoined, purposed, begun, "to perform, accomplish, complete:" cf. 2 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 6, 11; Phil. i. 6. Taking ἐπιτελεῖσθαι in the present place as middle (to which there is no objection on the ground of usage, the middle voice of this verb being not uncommon in classical writers, and ἐπιτελεῖσθε in Gal. iii. 3 being not improbably middle,—cf. Lightfoot, *in loc.*), Huther translates, "that the same sufferings are accomplishing themselves in your brotherhood." Hofmann, holding to the middle voice, but taking it with a transitive force, makes τὰ αὐτά object instead of subject. He draws attention to the fact that, where οἶδα is in N. T. followed by an infinitive, the construction is all but invariably not that of the accusative with the infinitive, but of an infinitive by itself, the governing verb being employed in the sense not of "knowing that," but of "knowing to, knowing how to,"—*e.g.* Matt. vii. 11; Phil. iv. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 9. Then, appealing to the occasional classical use of the middle voice of ἐπιτελεῖν with a force similar to that not uncommon in the active, "pay," but with a metaphorical application (as in Xenophon, *Mem.* iv. 8, τὰ τοῦ γήρως ἐπιτελεῖσθαι; *Apol.* 33, τὸν θάνατον ἐπιτελεῖσθαι), he renders the words in our passage, "knowing how to pay—for your Christianity—the like tribute of affliction (*den gleichen Leidenszoll zu entrichten*) with your brethren in the world." This exegesis is characteristically ingenious; but serious objections to it are, that nothing whatever in the context suggests the somewhat peculiar and remote idea of tribute, and that the article with παθημάτων appears naturally in the connection to point to "*your* afflictions."

On the whole, the view which probably *prima facie* occurs to every reader, that ἐπιτελεῖσθαι is passive, and the construction that of the accusative with the infinitive (as after οἶδα in Luke iv. 41), appears to be the most satisfactory; and there is no good ground for deviating from the ordinary N. T. sense of ἐπιτελεῖν. The meaning then is, "Knowing, as ye do, that the same sufferings are being accomplished on your brotherhood in the world." Every word of the clause carries in it a support to the sorely-tried believers. The Christians of Asia Minor should not deem themselves to be treated in any exceptional way, or reckon their sufferings as a "strange thing" (iv. 12). These sufferings (παθημάτων having, no doubt, as its direct reference the "fightings without," but also by immediate suggestion bringing up the "fears within," which were so apt to become μέριμναι) were common to all the brotherhood,—arising, indeed, out of those common relations to Christ which made them a brotherhood. As Christ "in the world" was crucified through the antagonism between the spirit of the world and His Spirit, so also "the brotherhood in the world" must in some form bear the cross after Him. Then the word "accomplished"—peculiar in its present application—is fitted to lead the thoughts up to a definite *plan* of Him who is infinitely wise and kind, of which these "sufferings" are a part. Involving, too, as ἐπιτελεῖν seems always to do, the idea of bringing to a complete and perfect end (see Ellicott on Gal. iii. 3), this verb vividly suggests the thought which in the next verse the apostle expresses, that even at the longest the sufferings of Christ's people are only for a little time, only while they are ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ—in the region of His foes.—On ἀδελφότης, cf. ii. 17, note.

Ver. 10. A cheering assurance that the struggling believers will not be left unaided, but that God will certainly carry on and complete His work of grace. The adversative δέ marks the transition from thoughts of suffering and strain to a reminder of that almighty help which ensures triumph. The

verse is singularly rich in encouragement. At the close one verb declaratory of the divine strengthening grace is piled upon another, as if utterly to overwhelm misgivings and fears; and, to prepare for an undoubting acceptance of these assurances, every word preceding is laden with truth fitted to gladden and animate. God is described as "the God of all grace,"—the God whose characteristic it is to bestow grace according to every need. On the frequent N. T. use of πᾶς, without an article, with abstract nouns, cf. i. 24, note; and on the addition to the name of God of a genitive of character, cf. 2 Cor. i. 3 (where also πᾶς is found); Phil. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 20. Then the apostle, assuming—according to the usual tone of the Epistles—that those to whom he wrote were in reality what their Christian profession intimated, reminds them that God had "called" them in conversion (cf. i. 15), "in and through union to Christ" (ἐν Χριστῷ being connected with καλέσας), "unto (for, to bring them to) His eternal glory" (the glory which He destines for His redeemed being His own glory, in so far as this is communicable to His creatures, —John xvii. 22; Rev. iii. 21; Rom. v. 2). God's "calling" of Christians is a pledge of all grace needed by them for ultimately coming to "glory;" Rom. viii. 30; Phil. i. 6; 1 Thess. v. 24. On the whole clause, compare 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 10. On the position of αὐτοῦ, cf. i. 3, note.

The words ὀλίγον παθόντας are by many scholars construed in connection with those verbs which follow them. In this case, the closing verbs are naturally held to point to the final act of grace whereby, at the Lord's Second Coming, His people shall be, with regard to their whole being, perfected and glorified. But the accumulation of verbs, and the emphasis laid on the promise of firmness and strength, suggest much more readily that this assurance has to do with the time when believers are still here on earth, still in the midst of struggle and liable to misgivings. Feeling this, some who adopt this construction (as Luther and Semler) find themselves compelled

to treat παθόντας as if it were a *present* participle; and others (as Benson), to hold that the promise includes deliverance for the Asiatic Christians from their sufferings, while still on earth, and then strengthening during the subsequent period of their lives. On the whole, it seems decidedly preferable to attach ὀλίγον παθόντας to καλέσας, "who called you in Christ with the intent to bring you to His eternal glory—after having suffered for a little while." The "high calling of God," whilst it has "glory" for its end, includes as certainly "suffering" as a preparatory agency. To ὀλίγον (on which cf. i. 6, note) the apostle has already provided a sublime antithesis in αἰώνιον; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 17. The position of the words ὀλίγον παθόντας—entering almost as if by second thought, after the clause appears to have been closed—is fitted to suggest in a very striking way the comparative unimportance of earthly sorrows, as seen in the light of heavenly glory.

Αὐτός has the full emphasis which regularly belongs to the nominative of this pronoun when expressed: "I have called on you to watch and to resist; you know well, however, what hopeless work this would be if success depended on your own strength, or on the help of other men,—but God *Himself* will sustain you."—The relation borne to each other by the three verbs with which the verse closes seems to be as follows. The first exhibiting God's sanctifying grace somewhat generally, the other two speak of the καταρτισμός in its action, *first*, in the way of *resistance* to the attacks of spiritual foes, keeping the soul stable in faith and love; *secondly*, in the way of vigour in *assailing* the enemy, strength to advance the kingdom of Christ. "Καταρτίσει, perficiet, ne remaneat in vobis defectus; στηρίξει, stabiliet, ne quid vos labefactet; σθενώσει, roborabit, ut superetis vim omnem adversam" (Bengel). With regard to the meaning of καταρτίζειν,—"to make ἄρτιος" (2 Tim. iii. 17), "to give a thing perfect adjustment to its purpose," either by rectifying something which is wrong, or by supplying something which is wanting, "to perfect,"—cf. Matt. iv. 21;

1 Cor. i. 10 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 9, 11 ; Heb. xiii. 21. On *στηρίζειν*, cf. 2 Thess. ii. 17, iii. 3. *Σθενοῦν* is a late and rare word, occurring here only in N. T.

Ver. 11. The gracious word of promise which God has given to the apostle for his brethren naturally leads up to a doxology,—which also most naturally, seeing that the assurance of the ministration of *strength* had been so prominent in the promise, ascribes to God specially *τὸ κράτος*. For this verse, see notes on the doxology in iv. 11, of which this is simply a somewhat shortened form. In the connection here the verb to be supplied is probably the indicative *ἐστί*, which is expressed in iv. 11.

Vv. 12–14. *Closing observations, salutations, and benediction.*

Ver. 12. According to the use of *διά* in such a connection as the present (on which see Bp. Lightfoot's note on Ignat. *Rom.* § 10), *διὰ Σιλουανοῦ* might describe Silvanus either as being the apostle's amanuensis or as the bearer of the letter. As regards this latter application, cf. *διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν*, Acts xv. 23. Silvanus may quite possibly have discharged both functions, but it seems clear at all events that he was the bearer. The extended statement of commendation given by the apostle would hardly have been relevant or natural, except with reference to one who was himself about to visit the Churches addressed.

Whether this Silvanus was that eminent evangelist, Silas or Silvanus (the short form in Acts, the longer in Paul's Epistles), who accompanied Paul in his second missionary journey, cannot be said with certainty. In favour of the supposition that this is the same, are the facts that the name was not a very common one, and that Silas, having been a distinguished teacher in the Church of Jerusalem before he joined Paul (Acts xv. 22, 32), must certainly have been well known to Peter. Then there is no difficulty in the way of our taking

him to have been with Peter at any time from about 55 A.D., seeing that nothing either in the Acts or in the Epistles gives ground for thinking of him as having been in association with Paul after that date. Supposing our Silvanus to have been Silas, it is obvious that, through his labours in Asia Minor many years before with Paul,—along with, quite possibly, of course, more recent visits,—he was peculiarly fitted, from acquaintance with the Churches in those parts, and from something of a parental feeling in relation to them, to be a helper of their faith, enforcing with sympathy and power the teachings of the apostolic letter which he conveyed. Assuming also as at least possible (see Introd. § V. 10), that among Peter's aims in writing his Epistle one was to show his cordial appreciation of Paul's doctrine and work, the fact of his choosing for his messenger to the Asiatic Churches a minister whom they had first known as Paul's colleague and friend, was eminently calculated to support the influence of the Epistle in this particular direction.

The construction of ὑμῖν is uncertain. It may be the remoter object of ἔγραψα,—in which case, to account for its position, we must suppose the commendatory words which follow regarding Silvanus to have entered by a kind of second thought, after the mention of him had appeared to be disposed of by the simple "through Silvanus." We may also connect the pronoun with τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, as a *dat. comm.* On this view the emphatic position of ὑμῖν would seem to give the word some such meaning as "the brother trustworthy in all circumstances, but whom you, from your experience of him, have special cause to acknowledge as such." An objection to this construction is, that to leave ἔγραψα without a dative is a little awkward, and not accordant with usage: cf. Gal. vi. 11; 1 Thess. v. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 14. Still, perhaps, on the whole, the latter of the two modes of connection is the more natural; and we may suppose that ὑμῖν, while immediately attached to τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, served also in the apostle's mind—as very readily in such a sentence it might—

for the remoter object of ἔγραψα.—On πιστός, cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17; Eph. vi. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 2.

The little clause ὡς λογίζομαι gives to that high opinion of Silvanus, which the article in τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ presupposes to be entertained by the Asiatic believers, the support of the apostle's hearty assent. There is nothing in the verb λογίζομαι of that hesitation which the rendering of the A. E. V., "I suppose," suggests as existing in Peter's mind. The word denotes a judgement founded on consideration of evidence or argument, "I reckon:" cf. Rom. iii. 28, vi. 11, viii. 18; Heb. xi. 19. Its force here is practically the same as that of πέποιθα or πέπεισμαι in Rom. xv. 14; Gal. v. 10; 2 Tim. i. 5. To a misapprehension with regard to the force of the word, and a consequent belief that Peter could not have appended a clause of the imagined hesitating kind to his expression of commendation regarding so distinguished a servant of Christ as Silvanus,—or, indeed, regarding any one, in such a connection as the present,—must no doubt be ascribed the construction followed in the Vulgate, and preferred by Beza and a few other scholars, which attaches ὡς λογίζομαι not to what precedes, but to δι' ὀλίγων,—"briefly, as I consider." This is decidedly the less natural connection of the little clause, and the sense yielded is comparatively pointless.

With δι' ὀλίγων, cf. διὰ βραχέων, Heb. xiii. 22; ἐν ὀλίγῳ, Eph. iii. 3; and δι' ὀλίγων γραμμάτων, Ignat. *Rom.* § 8; *Polyc.* § 7. Whilst the Epistle is no doubt one of considerable length, yet the apostle feels it to be short when looked at in relation to all that, on subjects so important, he might profitably have said, and from his affectionate interest in his suffering brethren would have said, had circumstances permitted; cf. the similar statement with respect to the much longer Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 22). In the connection in which Peter puts the words here, it seems natural to think that one object of his mention of the brevity of his communication was to direct the readers to Silvanus, "the trustworthy

brother," as one well fitted to expand the teaching and exhortation which were given them in the letter; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17.

On the epistolary aorist—the tense used as from the point of view of the *receiver* of a letter, and in English rendered by the present or, as here, the perfect — cf. Winer, p. 347; A. Buttmann, p. 198. As illustrations, see Acts xxiii. 30; Eph. vi. 22; Phil. ii. 28. With respect to the verb γράφειν, Winer, Ellicott (on Gal. vi. 11, and elsewhere), and some other scholars, are disposed to doubt whether its aorist is ever in N. T. to be explained as used in this way, and to regard ἔγραψα in every case where it occurs as being an ordinary narrative aorist, referring to an earlier letter (as 2 Cor. ii. 3), or to the previous part of the letter (as 1 Cor. ix. 15, and here). As to those cases in which the reference is to an earlier letter (of which cases some of the older scholars, without any naturalness or likelihood, and in manifest inconsistency with δευτέραν, 2 Ep. iii. 1, imagined the present to be one) there is, of course, no room for debate; but with respect to the rest there does not seem to be sufficient reason for taking them as other than epistolary aorists. To count them such explains most naturally in all the instances the use of this tense, and in at least one, Philem. 19, the other view is wholly unnatural. In Gal. vi. 11, too, the opinion that ἔγραψα does not refer to the previous part of the Epistle, may quite reasonably be held to have the greater likelihood; see Bp. Lightfoot, *in loc.* The epistolary aorist does not seem to have been a form conventionally employed in certain words merely, but the expression of a particular mode of thinking. Among the Latin writers this preterite style in letters prevailed even more than among the Greek; cf. Zumpt, *Lat. Gram.* § 503.

In the clause which follows, Peter mentions the main constituents of his Epistle in such a way as to indicate what had been his aim in composing it,—partly hortatory, partly to give a testimony. He states the two as co-ordinate, as indeed they are in all healthful religious teaching,—enunciation

of truth having in view the sustenance of practical godliness, exhortation looking back to doctrine to give it weight and point. On this ground we may safely say that, while the apostle speaks of the two elements separately, yet he was not, as some have imagined, thinking of two distinct parts of his letter. This does not seem at all natural. It is, no doubt, true that the first half of the first chapter has more of continuous doctrine, or "testimony," than the rest of the letter, so that we may for convenience speak of it as the doctrinal section; but with the practical advices which occupy much of what follows, dogmatic teaching also largely intermingles itself.—The verb παρακαλεῖν may, according to N. T. use, mean "to exhort," "to console," or "to encourage;" and, considering what has been the strain of the letter, it is in the present case (as occasionally elsewhere, *e.g.* 1 Thess. iii. 2) not quite easy to decide which is the precise idea,—the writer's thought, indeed, perhaps really in different degrees comprehending all. "Exhorting," as the word of widest reference, including all kinds of practical religious injunction and advice, is probably the best rendering. For παρακαλεῖν used without an expressed object, cf. 2 Cor. v. 20; Tit. i. 9; Heb. x. 25.—In the verb ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν (found here only in N. T.) the preposition has been by some interpreters held to have the force of "in addition." Thus Bengel, *insuper testans, i.e.* as he explains, "in addition to the testimony given to you long ago by Paul and Silas." The classical use of the word does not appear to support this special force, either as held by Bengel, or in the derivative form maintained by Macknight and others, "strongly testifying." As in many compounds, ἐπί here merely gives a certain notion of activity and aim; cf. ii. 21, note.

What the apostle ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ—bears testimony to as a "witness" (v. 1), called on to tell what he had seen of the work, character, sufferings, and glories of Christ, and what he had been taught by Him—is "that this is the true grace of God." With the reading of T. R., ταύτην would have for its comple-

ment the relative clause εἰς ἣν ἑστήκατε. But, accepting the much better supported reading στῆτε,—out of which ἑστήκατε has arisen probably through a feeling that this form had greater naturalness, a feeling sustained by an echo in the copyist's memory of Rom. v. 2 and 1 Cor. xv. 1,—we must regard the demonstrative as retrospective, "that which has been set forth in the Epistle, and which, writing to you as Christians, I have throughout assumed you to have embraced." Looking to the predicate χάριν, what is referred to in ταύτην is naturally taken to be the provision made in Christ for man's salvation, and proclaimed in the gospel: "that this is the true grace of God"—the true manifestation of His mercy to lost man, on which you may implicitly rely. It is evident, from the whole tenor of the Epistle, that the trials which had come upon the Asiatic Churches were known by Peter to have caused most painful perplexity to many of the members (cf. especially iv. 12). Was it not, they thought, possible that, after all, they had been mistaken? Even supposing, what many strong proofs led them to believe, that Jesus was the Divine Saviour, still might there not be some fatal defect in the form of doctrine regarding Him which had been presented to them? Could it be that, if Christ loved them, they should suffer such things? The apostle in his letter has answered such questionings. He has shown his brethren the gracious object of affliction, has expatiated on the sublime dignity into which faith in Christ brings men, and has, with peculiar emphasis, again and again given the assurance that the form of teaching which the Asiatic Christians had received was that which truly set forth the salvation (χάρις, i. 10) promised through the prophets, and looked on with profound interest by the angels (i. 12),—that the message of glad tidings which had been received by these Churches of Asia Minor was in very deed the λόγος ζῶν Θεοῦ καὶ μένων (i. 23, 25). By ταύτην here, therefore, he means, no doubt, "this provision in Christ for salvation which I have illustrated in my letter, and which you recognise as at all points the same that you

have been told of before, and have accepted." On the special force of this statement regarded as a cordial recognition by Peter of the soundness and authoritativeness of the teaching of the Apostle Paul, through whom the Churches of Asia Minor had been founded, see Introd. § V. 10.

Seeing that ἀληθῆ χάριν is the predicate, the absence of the article simply intimates that, whether χάριν is definite or not, at all events no stress is laid on definiteness. We cannot by any English rendering exhibit precisely this indeterminateness,—"*a* true grace" going somewhat too decidedly in one direction, "*the* true grace" in another, and the simple "true grace" passing from the concrete to the abstract. Knowing, however, as we do, that the grace spoken of is in fact that in which all the gifts of divine grace to men are summed up, the best rendering is with the definite article.

The relative clause which ends the verse "is a short and earnest exhortation, containing the pith of what has been said by way of exhortation in the whole Epistle" (Alford): "in which grace—blessed system of saving influences—stand ye," or, more exactly, bringing out fully the thought involved in the pregnant construction of εἰς joined to a verb of rest, "into which as ye have entered by faith, so now stand therein." For this pregnant use of εἰς, not uncommon in classical Greek (Jelf, § 646. 1), and growing more frequent in the later writers, cf. iii. 20; Mark xiii. 3; John xxi. 4; Acts viii. 40; Heb. xi. 9; and see Winer, p. 516; A. Buttmann, p. 332. Cf. also the use of ἐπί, iv. 14.

Ver. 13. As to what is meant by "Babylon" here, see Introd. § IV. — Ἡ συνεκλεκτή, "the co-elect" (namely, "with you," ἐκλεκτοῖς, i. 1), cannot well have any other reference than to the Church of Babylon. The supposition of some interpreters, that Peter's wife, or some other well-known Christian woman, is meant, does not accord with the mode of expression. The words ἡ ἐν *B.*, taken thus, would plainly, through the definiteness of the form, imply that there was not—and that it was well known that there was not—

any other believing woman in Babylon. The fact that the following salutation is from an individual, Marcus, does not make it even slightly probable that but one person is meant here also. Supposing that, as was most natural, the Christian association in Babylon, learning that the apostle, resident at the time among them, was writing a letter to their brethren in Asia Minor, expressed in some way their desire that he should send their united salutation, nothing also was more natural than that a minister not connected specially with the Babylonian Church, but who was in the city at the time, and who, besides, had formerly laboured in Asia Minor (2 Tim. iv. 11), should add his good wishes separately. From very early times the reference was held to be to the Church. This is shown by the fact that Codex ℵ, and a considerable number of other ancient authorities, actually insert the word *ἐκκλησία* before *συνεκλεκτή*. This supplement, however, seems to miss the precise representation. The apostle's expression rather exhibits a personification, based on the very familiar O. T. language regarding the Church as being "the daughter of Zion," who was God's "elect." The R. E. V. renders well, "She that is in Babylon, elect with you." Compare, as perhaps parallels to this personification, 2 John 1, 13, with Westcott's notes. The compound *συνεκλεκτός* seems not to occur anywhere but in the present passage.

There is no likelihood that, when the apostle calls Marcus his "son," we are to regard "son" as used in its literal sense. It is obviously probable that, in a public circular letter like the present, a salutation by an individual would not be sent on the ground solely of relationship to the writer, but only by a person who, either from general eminence in the Church or from having himself laboured in those parts, was known to the Christians addressed. Now tradition, very busy with the history of the Apostle Peter, has yet not a word of any son of his as being a minister or a person of note in the Church. It is natural, therefore, to take *υἱός* in the secondary sense of a warmly-attached and very helpful younger friend or disciple,

perhaps implying also one who had been converted to Christ through the apostle's labours. There is no objection to this view in the fact that the word which the Apostle Paul employs with this force is τέκνον (*e.g.* 1 Tim. i. 2, 18), for υἱός is in itself equally suitable for this application, and is employed both in N. T. and LXX. in the sense of "disciple" (Matt. xii. 27; Luke xi. 19; 2 Kings ii. 3, 5).

The identification of the Mark of our passage with Mark the evangelist has much in its favour. From the very early time of Papias (as reported by Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 39)—and indeed practically, according to Papias's statement of authority (ὁ πρεσβύτερος), from the age when Mark was still alive—there was a uniform tradition that the writer of the second Gospel was closely associated with Peter, and that his Gospel thus represented in a special way Peter's oral teaching regarding the life of our Lord. Accepting also the other tradition as on every ground probable, that Mark the evangelist was that John Mark, cousin of Barnabas, who accompanied Paul and his kinsman during a part of their missionary tour, we find in the narrative given in Acts xii. 12–17 evidence leading to the belief that Peter was an intimate friend of Mark's mother and her family. Taking all the facts into view, we seem to have a very strong probability that the Mark of the verse before us is the same who is known to us elsewhere; and remembering that the "sharp contention" many years before between Paul and Barnabas, which led to Paul's taking Silas as the companion of his second journey, had been with reference to the trustworthiness of Mark, the conjunction of names which we have here, Mark's sending his salutation through Silas, is a pleasant one. All soreness of feeling arising out of the matter had among all concerned long passed away; cf. particularly 2 Tim. iv. 11.

Ver. 14. From the earliest times the kiss has been among Orientals a usual token of kindly and respectful greeting. How fully this was the case among the Jews, many references both in the Old and New Testaments show. In the early

Christian Church the kiss was commonly used everywhere as an acknowledgement of brotherhood in Christ, the religious character of the salutation being marked by such names as that which we have here, *φίλημα ἀγάπης*,—*ἀγάπη* denoting that pure love which is of God, 1 John iv. 8 (the very word *ἀγάπη*, indeed, being one not used by any heathen writer, but belonging to the language of revealed religion; cf. Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 12). Elsewhere in Scripture this kiss is called *φίλημα ἅγιον* (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26). In later writers again we have "osculum pacis" (Tertull. *De Orat.* 18), *τὸ ἐν Κυρίῳ φίλημα* (*Const. Apost.* ii. 57. 12), and the like. In the first ages the believers seem to have greeted each other in this way on perhaps every occasion of their meeting for a religious service; and, even after having been to a considerable extent discontinued, through abuses which, amid declining spirituality, connected themselves with the custom, the kiss was retained for many ages at the observance of the Communion,—passing quite out of use in the Western Church only about the thirteenth century. In the Greek and some other Eastern Churches it is still retained in a measure. For a full and interesting account of the "kiss of love," see *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*, Art. "Kiss."

The general principle underlying Peter's *ἀσπάσασθε* here, and Paul's in the passages referred to above, is obviously that it is good for Christians, on all fitting occasions, to express their brotherly interest in each other, not merely by material kindnesses, but by the forms of courtesy recognised in their age and country. Immediately, however, we have not here a general precept, but simply a request bearing on the procedure of the various congregations at the time when the Epistle should be read before them. That the aorist imperative, which is used in all the places, has its primary reference to an act to be done at once, is shown particularly by the mode of expression in 1 Thess. v. 25, 26,—the immediately preceding clause being a request for *habitual* help to the apostle through the prayers of his brethren, and this given by the

present imperative. The wish of the apostles was, that the hearty acceptance by the believers of the message of advice and consolation which Christ had sent them through His servants should be expressed by their giving to each other the sign of their having that love in Christ without which the Church is feeble and joyless. At the same time, the kiss given to each other in such circumstances could not but be felt as conveying the apostle's own affectionate greeting to every one of them.—The preposition ἐν being found with φιλήματι in all the passages of greeting, it would seem that, when joined to ἀσπάζεσθαι, this was the usual form of expression in the Church. In Luke xxii. 48, where παραδιδόναι is the verb, the simple dative φιλήματι is used. In the present connection ἐν can hardly be said to have exactly the mere instrumental force so common in the Hellenistic writers; rather it has its semi-local sense,—the salutation itself being found in, lying in, the "kiss of love."

As the apostle had begun the letter with the benediction, "Peace be to you" (i. 2), so with the same restful word he closes; cf. 2 Thess. iii. 16. To the simple ὑμῖν πᾶσιν he appends τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, as if saying in love, and at the same time with deep solemnity, "Peace be to you,—and bear ever in mind, dear brethren, that true peace can be only to those who are in Christ;" cf. Eph. vi. 24.

THE END.

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

In One Volume, 8*vo*, 640 *pp.*, *price* 15*s.*,

HISTORY OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Professor E. REUSS, D.D.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION.

CONTENTS.—Introduction. Book First:—History of the Origin of the New Testament Writings—History of the Literature. Book Second:—History of the Collection of the New Testament Writings—History of the Canon. Book Third:—History of the Preservation of the New Testament Writings—History of the Text. Book Fourth:—History of the Circulation of the New Testament Writings—History of the Versions. Book Fifth:—History of the Theological Use of the New Testament Writings—History of Exegesis.

'It would be hard to name any single volume which contains so much that is helpful to the student of the New Testament. . . . Considering that so much ground is covered, the fulness and accuracy of the information given are remarkable. Professor Reuss's work is not that of a compiler, but of an original thinker, who throughout this encyclopædic volume depends much more on his own research than on the labours of his predecessors. . . . The translation is thoroughly well done, accurate, and full of life.'—*Expositor.*

'One of the most valuable volumes of Messrs. Clark's valuable publications. . . . Its usefulness is attested by undiminished vitality. . . . His method is admirable, and he unites German exhaustiveness with French lucidity and brilliancy of expression. . . . The sketch of the great exegetic epochs, their chief characteristics, and the critical estimates of the most eminent writers, is given by the author with a compression and a mastery that have never been surpassed.'—Archdeacon Farrar.

'I think the work of Reuss exceedingly valuable.'—Professor C. A. Briggs, D.D.

'I know of no work on the same topic more scholarly and at the same time readable, and I regard the work as one of real value to scholars.'—President Alvah Hovey, Newton Theological Institute.

'A work of rare and long-tested merit. . . . I am sure that every theological teacher will be glad to be able to refer his students to it.'—Professor P. H. Seenstra, Cambridge, Mass.

In crown 8*vo*, *price* 3*s.* 6*d.*,

THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

A Discussion of the Chief Problems in Old Testament History, as opposed to the Development Theorists.

By Dr. FRIEDRICH EDUARD KÖNIG,

THE UNIVERSITY, LEIPZIG.

Translated by Rev. ALEXANDER J. CAMPBELL, M.A.

'An admirable little volume. . . . By sincere and earnest-minded students it will be cordially welcomed.'—*Freeman.*

'Every page of the book deserves study.'—*Church Bells.*

In crown 8*vo*, *price* 5*s.* 6*d.*,

CREATION;

OR, THE BIBLICAL COSMOGONY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENCE.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS.

By Professor ARNOLD GUYOT, LL.D.

'Written with much knowledge and tact, . . . suggestive and stimulating.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'The issue of this book is a fitting conclusion to a beautiful career. . . . This, his last book, coming from the author's deathbed, will serve two causes; it will aid science by showing that it is a friend of the faith, and it will aid Christianity by showing that it need not fear the test of the latest scientific research.'—*Presbyterian Review.*

Now complete, in Four Volumes, imperial 8vo, price 12s. 6d. each,

COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND MAPS.

EDITED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

CONTRIBUTORS.

The Very Rev. Dean HOWSON; The Very Rev. Dean PLUMPTRE; Principal DAVID BROWN, D.D.; J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D.; W. MILLIGAN, D.D.; W. F. MOULTON, D.D.; Rev. Canon SPENCE; MARCUS DODS, D.D.; J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D.; JOSEPH ANGUS, D.D.; PATON J. GLOAG, D.D.; S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D.; WILLIAM B. POPE, D.D.; PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.; MATTHEW B. RIDDLE, D.D.

Maps and Plans—Professor ARNOLD GUYOT.

Illustrations—W. M. THOMSON, D.D., Author of 'The Land and the Book.'

Volume I.
THE SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS.

Volume II.
ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, and THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Volume III.
ROMANS TO PHILEMON.

Volume IV.
HEBREWS TO REVELATION.

'A useful, valuable, and instructive commentary. The interpretation is set forth with clearness and cogency, and in a manner calculated to commend the volumes to the thoughtful reader. The book is beautifully got up, and reflects great credit on the publishers as well as the writers.'—*The Bishop of Gloucester.*

'I have looked into this volume, and read several of the notes on crucial passages. They seem to me very well done, with great fairness, and with evident knowledge of the controversies concerning them. The illustrations are very good. I cannot doubt that the book will prove very valuable.'—*The Bishop of Winchester.*

'We have already spoken of this commentary with warm praise, and we can certainly assert that the enterprise has now been brought to a close with really admirable work.' —*English Churchman.*

'We congratulate Dr. Schaff on the completion of this useful work, which we are now able to commend, in its complete form, to English readers of the Scriptures. . . . It will be seen that we have a high opinion of this commentary, of the present volume, and also of the whole work. In this last respect it is perhaps of more uniform excellence than any of its rivals, and in beauty of appearance it excels them all.'—*Church Bells.*

'External beauty and intrinsic worth combine in the work here completed. Good paper, good type, good illustrations, good binding, please the eye, as accuracy and thoroughness in matter of treatment satisfy the judgment. Everywhere the workmanship is careful, solid, harmonious.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

'There are few better commentaries having a similar scope and object; indeed, within the same limits, we do not know of one so good upon the whole of the New Testament.' —*Literary World.*

'We predict that this work will take its place among the most popular of the century. . . . The publishers have spared no pains to secure volumes that shall be worthy of the theme, and of the scholarship of the age.'—*Freeman.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d.,

THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES

ENTIRELY SPURIOUS.

A Reply to the Right Rev. Dr. Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham.

BY W. D. KILLEN, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL OF THE PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL FACULTY, IRELAND.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In demy 8vo, price 9s.,

THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH.

In Two Volumes, 8vo (1600 pages), price 24s.,

THE DOCTRINE OF SACRED SCRIPTURE.

A Critical, Historical, and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments.

By GEORGE T. LADD, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY, YALE COLLEGE.

'It is not very easy to give an account of this very considerable and important work within the compass of one short notice. . . . It is one which will certainly be studied by all scientific theologians, and the general reader will probably find here a better summary of the whole subject than in any other work or series of works.'—*Church Bells.*

'A scientific method of treating the phenomena and place of the Bible such as this will have special value in these days; as such we very heartily commend it to all interested in the great question of Divine revelation through Jesus Christ of which the Bible is the medium, and in which all its teachings find their reason and inspiration and relations.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'This important work is pre-eminently adapted for students, and treats in an exhaustive manner nearly every important subject of Biblical criticism which is agitating the religious mind at the present day.'—*Contemporary Review.*

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

BIBLICALLY AND HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

(*TENTH SERIES OF CUNNINGHAM LECTURES.*)

By JAS. S. CANDLISH, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

'As to the ability of this volume there can be no question: it is of profound interest, touches on time-present subjects, is free from all rhetorical display, is in no sense superficial, but scholarly and able, and is worthy of the reputation and position of its author.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

'Able and learned. . . . Theological students will find it valuable, and to their attention we most earnestly commend it.'—*Watchman.*

'Dr. Candlish treats his subject with an admirable combination of scholarly comprehensiveness, historical candour, and regard to the practical demands of mankind.'—*Christian World.*

'Dr. Candlish has in the present volume given evidence of great freshness of thought, broad mental grasp, careful scholarship, and keen logical acumen, lighted up by imaginative beauty, and quickened by fervent emotion. . . . Its historical review is clear, succinct, and comprehensive; its hermeneutics are sound and judicious; its theology is evangelical; its tone is healthy and inspiring; and altogether, it is a volume which is sure to become a classic.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'A charming book, written with unaffected ease and perfect lucidity, and therefore to be read with delight. Perhaps a magic pen belongs to the house of Candlish. . . . The book is positively good, and ought to be thoroughly popular with the larger religious public.'—*Monthly Interpreter.*

'An able, historical, and dispassionate account of the working of the various theories of Church unity in earlier ages.'—*Literary Churchman.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

SERMONS TO THE SPIRITUAL MAN.

By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D.

'A uniform excellence pervades the tone, style, and thought of this volume. . . . We express our gratitude to the author for his able and helpful book.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

SERMONS TO THE NATURAL MAN.

'Characterized by profound knowledge of divine truth, and presenting the truth in a chaste and attractive style, the sermons carry in their tone the accents of the solemn feeling of responsibility to which they owe their origin.'—*Weekly Review.*

In One Volume, crown 8vo, price 5s., Third Edition,

LIGHT FROM THE CROSS.

SERMONS ON THE PASSION OF OUR LORD.

Translated from the German of A. THOLUCK, D.D.

'With no ordinary confidence and pleasure, we commend these most noble, solemnizing, and touching discourses.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

In crown 8vo, price 6s.,

THE INCARNATE SAVIOUR.

A LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST.

By Rev. W. R. NICOLL, M.A.

'It commands my warm sympathy and admiration. I rejoice in the circulation of such a book, which I trust will be the widest possible.'—Canon Liddon.

'There was quite room for such a volume. It contains a great deal of thought, often penetrating and always delicate, and pleasingly expressed. The subject has been very carefully studied, and the treatment will, I believe, furnish much suggestive matter both to readers and preachers.'—Rev. Principal Sanday.

In crown 8vo, Eighth Edition, price 6s.,

THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR;

OR, MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST DAYS OF THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

By F. W. KRUMMACHER, D.D.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In crown 8vo, Second Edition, price 6s.,

DAVID, THE KING OF ISRAEL.

A PORTRAIT DRAWN FROM BIBLE HISTORY AND THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

WORKS BY THE LATE
PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL, AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

In crown 8vo, price 6s.,

PASTORAL THEOLOGY: A Treatise on the Office and Duties of the Christian Pastor. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author.

'Much of the volume is devoted to the theory and practice of preaching, and this part we can most heartily commend; it is replete with valuable suggestions, which even those who have had some experience in the ministry will find calculated to make them more attractive and efficient preachers.'—*Christian Observer.*

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s., Sixth Edition,

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE, viewed in connection with the whole Series of the Divine Dispensations.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Fourth Edition,

EZEKIEL, AND THE BOOK OF HIS PROPHECY: An Exposition. With a new Translation.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Second Edition,

PROPHECY viewed in its Distinctive Nature, its Special Functions, and Proper Interpretation.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

HERMENEUTICAL MANUAL; or, Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the Scriptures of the New Testament.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE REVELATION OF LAW IN SCRIPTURE, considered with respect both to its own Nature and to its Relative Place in Successive Dispensations. (The Third Series of the 'Cunningham Lectures.')

In crown 8vo, price 3s. 6d.,

VOICES OF THE PROPHETS.

By EDWIN H. GIFFORD, D.D.,

ARCHDEACON OF LONDON, AND CANON OF ST. PAUL'S.

'The Author has long ago attained high position as a scholar, a man of science and a theologian, and in the volume before us he offers his readers some of the best fruits of these varied accomplishments.'—*Standard.*

In Two Volumes 8vo, price 21s.,

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN.

By Dr. JULIUS MÜLLER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF THE FIFTH EDITION

By Rev. WM. URWICK, M.A.

In demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

A CHRONOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION TO

THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

By C. E. CASPARI.

'The work is handy and well suited for the use of the student. It gives him, in very reasonable compass and in well-digested forms, a great deal of information respecting the dates and outward circumstances of our Lord's life, and materials for forming a judgment upon the various disputed points arising out of them.'—*Guardian.*

In crown 8vo, Second Edition, price 4s.,

PRINCIPLES OF NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATION.

By Rev. JAMES SCOTT, M.A., D.D.

'In terse and well-ordered style the Author deals with a subject too little studied and less understood. He shows himself to be, in the best sense of the word, rational in his method and conclusions. . . . Strength, acuteness, sound judgment, and reason, chastened by reverence, pervade this book, which, with pleasure, we commend to all students of Holy Scripture.'—*Record.*

In Twenty-four Volumes, demy 8vo, subscription price £4, 4s.,

WORKS OF DR. JOHN OWEN.

EDITED BY Rev. W. H. GOOLD, D.D., EDINBURGH.

The COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, *in Seven Volumes, may be had separately, price* 42*s.*

WORKS OF JOHN CALVIN.

COMMENTARIES, 45 VOLS.
TRACTS ON THE REFORMATION, 3 VOLS.

A *Selection* of Six Volumes (or more at the same proportion) for 21s., with the exception of PSALMS, vols. I. and V.; HABAKKUK, and CORINTHIANS, 2 vols.
Any separate Volume (with the above exceptions), 6s.
The LETTERS, edited by Dr. Bonnet, 2 vols., 10s. 6d.
The INSTITUTES, 2 vols., translated, 14s.
The INSTITUTES, in Latin, 2 vols., Tholuck's Edition (*Subscription price*), 14s.

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s., Second Edition,

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

A REVIEW OF THE PRINCIPAL DOCTRINAL DISCUSSIONS IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH SINCE THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

By THE LATE WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL, AND PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

In crown 8vo, Third Edition, price 5s.,

THE NEWER CRITICISM AND THE ANALOGY OF THE FAITH.

By ROBERT WATTS, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S COLLEGE, BELFAST.

'This work will be of immense value to all who are interested in refuting the attempts made in so many quarters to invalidate the Divine origin of the Old Testament revelation.'—*English Churchman.*

1.50

Date Due

3/19/47			
3/1/53			
12/12/57			
2-19-59			
MAR 4 1967			
MAR			
MAR 1 1969			
MAR 19 1969			
MAR 20 1970			
MAY 15 1971			
MAY 30 19[illegible]			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

BS
2795
J73

24344

Johnstone, R.
The first Epistle of Peter.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DA RE
2-18-67	Wayne Jameson	
3-4-67	Renew	
FEB 15 '69	B. Ben	
MAR 5 '69	J. Moor	
3/6/70	[illegible]	
MAY 1 '71	[illegible]	
MAY 17 '75		
SEP 2		

DEMCO